ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

FOR

THE YEAR 1920

IN ONE VOLUME
AND A SUPPLEMENTAL VOLUME

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1925

ADDITIONAL COPIES
OF THIS PUBLICATION MAY BE PROCURED FROM
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D. C.
AT
$1.00 PER COPY (Cloth).

U.S. Govt.
11-6-1925

LETTER OF SUBMITTAL

April 11, 1924.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the act of incorporation of the American Historical Association, approved January 4, 1889, I have the honor to submit to Congress the annual report of the association for the year 1920. I have the honor to be,

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

Charles D. Walcott, *Secretary.*

ACT OF INCORPORATION

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Andrew D. White, of Ithaca, in the State of New York; George Bancroft, of Washington, in the District of Columbia; Justin Winsor, of Cambridge, in the State of Massachusetts; William F. Poole, of Chicago, in the State of Illinois; Herbert B. Adams, of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland; Clarence W. Bowen, of Brooklyn, in the State of New York, their associates and successors, are hereby created, in the District of Columbia, a body corporate and politic by the name of the American Historical Association, for the promotion of historical studies, the collection and preservation of historical manuscripts, and for kindred purposes in the interest of American history and of history in America. Said association is authorized to hold real and personal estate in the District of Columbia so far only as may be necessary to its lawful ends to an amount not exceeding $500,000, to adopt a constitution, and make by-laws not inconsistent with law. Said association shall have its principal office at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and may hold its annual meetings in such places as the said incorporators shall determine. Said association shall report annually to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution concerning its proceedings and the condition of historical study in America. Said secretary shall communicate to Congress the whole of such report, or such portions thereof as he shall see fit. The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution are authorized to permit said association to deposit its collections, manuscripts, books, pamphlets, and other material for history in the Smithsonian Institution or in the National Museum at their discretion, upon such conditions and under such rules as they shall prescribe.

[Approved, January 4, 1889.]

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., June 30, 1921.

SIR: As provided by law, we have the honor to submit herewith the Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the year 1920. This report includes the usual statement, in detail, of the proceedings of the association during the year 1920 and certain important papers read at the annual meeting in December. A supplemental volume contains a bibliography of writings on American History during the year 1920, compiled by Miss Grace Gardner Griffin.

Very respectfully yours,

H. BARRETT LEARNED,
Chairman of the Committee on Publications.
ALLEN R. BOYD, *Editor.*

To the SECRETARY OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
Washington, D. C.

CONTENTS

Page

I. Proceedings of the thirty-fifth annual meeting of the American Historical Association 31

II. Proceedings of the sixteenth annual meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association 113

III. Proceedings of the sixteenth annual conference of historical societies. 129

Progress in the collection of war records by State war history organizations, by Karl Singewald 135

Progress in the collection of war history records by State war history organizations, by Albert E. McKinley 145

IV. Conference on economic history 153

The recognition of economic history as a distinct subject, by Clive Day 155

The field for the teaching of economic history in colleges and secondary schools, by Abbott Payson Usher 156

Fields of research in economic history: Labor, by Frank T. Carlton 159

Agriculture as a field for historical research (abstract), by Louis B. Schmidt 161

V. The origin of the Russian state on the Dnieper, by Mikhail Rostovtsev. 163

VI. Recent realignment in the history of medieval medicine and science, by Fielding H. Garrison 173

VII. Latin as an international language in the Middle Ages, by Louis J. Paetow 179

VIII. The enlightened despotism, by George Matthew Dutcher 187

IX. The establishment of a new Poland, by Lucius H. Holt 199

X. The settlement at Plymouth contemplated before 1620, by Lincoln N. Kinnicutt 209

XI. Capitalistic and socialistic tendencies in the Puritan colonies, by Clive Day 223

XII. The heritage of the Puritans, by David Saville Muzzey 237

XIII. Philadelphia and the embargo of 1808, by Louis M. Sears 251

XIV. Agrarian discontent in the South, 1880–1900, by Benjamin B. Kendrick. 265

XV. The development of electromagnetism during the last hundred years, by A. E. Kennelly 273

XVI. Description and travel as source material for the history of early agriculture in Pennsylvania, by Rayner W. Kelsey 283

XVII. The early development of agricultural societies in the United States, by Rodney C. True 293

XVIII. History of the ranch cattle industry in Oklahoma, by Edward Everett Dale 307

SUPPLEMENTAL VOLUME

Writings on American History, 1920, compiled by Grace Gardner Griffin.

CONSTITUTION

I

The name of this society shall be the American Historical Association.

II

Its object shall be the promotion of historical studies.

III

Any person approved by the executive council may become a member by paying $3, and after the first year may continue a member by paying an annual fee of $3. On payment of $50 any person may become a life member, exempt from fees. Persons not resident in the United States may be elected as honorary or corresponding members and be exempt from the payment of fees.

IV

The officers shall be a president, two vice presidents, a secretary, a treasurer, an assistant secretary-treasurer, and an editor.

The president, vice presidents, secretary, and treasurer shall be elected by ballot at each regular annual meeting in the manner provided in the by-laws.

The assistant secretary-treasurer and the editor shall be elected by the executive council. They shall perform such duties and receive such compensation as the council may determine.

V

There shall be an executive council, constituted as follows:

1. The president, the vice presidents, the secretary, and the treasurer.
2. Elected members, eight in number, to be chosen annually in the same manner as the officers of the association.
3. The former presidents; but a former president shall be entitled to vote for the three years succeeding the expiration of his term as president, and no longer.

VI

The executive council shall conduct the business, manage the property, and care for the general interests of the association. In the exercise of its proper functions, the council may appoint such committees, commissions, and boards as it may deem necessary. The council shall make a full report of its activities to the annual meeting of the association. The association may by vote at any annual meeting instruct the executive council to discontinue or enter upon any activity, and may take such other action in directing the affairs of the association as it may deem necessary and proper.

VII

This constitution may be amended at any annual meeting, notice of such amendment having been given at the previous annual meeting or the proposed amendment having received the approval of the executive council.

BY-LAWS

I

The officers provided for by the constitution shall have the duties and perform the functions customarily attached to their respective offices with such others as may from time to time be prescribed.

II

A nomination committee of five members shall be chosen at each annual business meeting in the manner hereafter provided for the election of officers of the association. At such convenient time prior to the 15th of September as it may determine, it shall invite every member to express to it his preference regarding every office to be filled by election at the ensuing annual business meeting and regarding the composition of the new nominating committee then to be chosen. It shall publish and mail to each member at least one month prior to the annual business meeting such nominations as it may determine upon for each elective office and for the next nominating committee. It shall prepare for use at the annual business meeting an official ballot containing, as candidates for each office or committee membership to be filled thereat, the names of its nominees and also the names of any other nominees which may be proposed to the chairman of the committee in writing by 20 or more members of the association at least one day before the annual business meeting, but such nominations by petition shall not be presented until after the committee shall have reported its nominations to the association, as provided for in the present by-law. The official ballot shall also provide under each office a blank space for voting for such further nominees as any member may present from the floor at the time of the election.

III

The annual election of officers and the choice of a nominating committee for the ensuing year shall be conducted by the use of an official ballot prepared as described in by-law II.

IV

The association authorizes the payment of traveling expenses incurred by the voting members of the council attending one meeting of that body a year, this meeting to be other than that held in connection with the annual meeting of the association.

The council may provide for the payment of expenses incurred by the secretary, the assistant secretary-treasurer, and the editor in such travel as may be necessary to the transaction of the association's business.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Organized at Saratoga, N. Y., September 10, 1884. Incorporated by Congress, January 4, 1889.

OFFICERS ELECTED DECEMBER 29, 1920

PRESIDENT:

JEAN JULES JUSSERAND, F. B. A.
French Embassy

VICE PRESIDENTS:

CHARLES H. HASKINS, PH. D.
Harvard University

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY, A. M., LL. D.
University of Pennsylvania

SECRETARY:

JOHN SPENCER BASSETT, PH. D.
Smith College

TREASURER:

CHARLES MOORE, PH. D.
Library of Congress

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL:

(In addition to the above-named officers)
(Ex-presidents)

JAMES FORD RHODES, LL. D., D. LITT.
Boston, Mass.

JOHN BACH McMASTER, A. M., PH. D., LITT. D., LL. D.
University of Pennsylvania

SIMEON E. BALDWIN, LL. D.
New Haven, Conn.

JOHN FRANKLIN JAMESON, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D.
Carnegie Institution of Washington

GEORGE BURTON ADAMS, PH. D., LITT. D.
Yale University

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D.
Harvard University

FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D.
Harvard University

WILLIAM MILLIGAN SLOANE, PH. D., L. H. D., LL. D.
Columbia University

WILLIAM ARCHIBALD DUNNING, PH. D., LL. D.
Columbia University

ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN, A. M., LL. B., LL. D.
University of Chicago

GEORGE LINCOLN BURR, LL. D., LITT. D.
Cornell University

WORTHINGTON C. FORD, A. M.
Massachusetts Historical Society

WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER, LL. D., LITT. D., L. H. D.
Cambridge

EDWARD CHANNING, PH. D.
Harvard University

(Elected Councilors)

JAMES T. SHOTWELL, PH. D.
Columbia University

RUTH PUTNAM, B. LITT.
Washington

ARTHUR L. CROSS, PH. D.
University of Michigan

SIDNEY B. FAY, PH. D.
Smith College

CARL RUSSELL FISH, PH. D.
University of Wisconsin

CARLTON J. H. HAYES, PH. D.
Columbia University

FREDERIC L. PAXSON, PH. D.
University of Wisconsin

ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT, PH. D.
University of Pennsylvania

PACIFIC COAST BRANCH

OFFICERS ELECTED NOVEMBER 26, 1920

PRESIDENT:

ROBERT C. CLARK, Ph. D.
University of Oregon

VICE PRESIDENT:

PAYSON J. TREAT, Ph. D.
Stanford University

SECRETARY-TREASURER:

J. J. VAN NOSTRAND, Jr., Ph. D.
University of California

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

(In addition to the above-named officers)

W. F. BLISS, A. M.
State Normal School, San Diego

SARA L. DOLE, A. B.
Manual Arts High School, Los Angeles

WALDEMAR C. WESTERGAARD, Ph. D.
Pomona College

TERMS OF OFFICE

(Deceased officers are marked thus: †)

EX-PRESIDENTS

†ANDREW DICKSON WHITE, L. H. D., LL. D., D. C. L., 1884–1885.
†GEORGE BANCROFT, LL. D., 1885–1886.
†JUSTIN WINSOR, LL. D., 1886–1887.
†WILLIAM FREDERICK POOLE, LL. D., 1887–1888.
†CHARLES KENDALL ADAMS, LL. D., 1888–1889.
†JOHN JAY, LL. D., 1889–1890.
†WILLIAM WIRT HENRY, LL. D., 1890–1891.
†JAMES BURRILL ANGELL, LL. D., 1891–1893.
†HENRY ADAMS, LL. D., 1893–1894.
†GEORGE FRISBIE HOAR, LL. D., 1895.
†RICHARD SALTER STORRS, D. D., LL. D., 1896.
†JAMES SCHOULER, LL. D., 1897.
†GEORGE PARK FISHER, D. D., LL. D., 1898.
JAMES FORD RHODES, LL. D., D. LITT., 1899.
†EDWARD EGGLESTON, L. H. D., 1900.
†CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, LL. D., 1901.
†ALFRED THAYER MAHAN, D. C. L., LL. D., 1902.
†HENRY CHARLES LEA, LL. D., 1903.
†GOLDWIN SMITH, D. C. L., LL. D., 1904.
JOHN BACH McMASTER, PH. D., LITT. D., LL. D., 1905.
SIMEON E. BALDWIN, LL. D., 1906.
J. FRANKLIN JAMESON, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D., 1907.
GEORGE BURTON ADAMS, PH. D., LITT. D., 1908
ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D., 1909.
FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D., 1910.
WILLIAM MILLIGAN SLOANE, PH. D., L. H. D., LL. D., 1911
†THEODORE ROOSEVELT, LL. D., D. C. L., 1912.
WILLIAM ARCHIBALD DUNNING, PH. D., LL. D., 1913.
ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN, A. M., LL. B., LL. D., 1914
†H. MORSE STEPHENS, M. A., LITT. D., 1915.
GEORGE LINCOLN BURR, LL. D., LITT. D., 1916.
WORTHINGTON C. FORD, A. M., 1917.
WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER, LL. D., LITT. D., L. H. D., 1918–1919.
EDWARD CHANNING, PH. D., 1920.

EX-VICE PRESIDENTS

†JUSTIN WINSOR, LL. D., 1884–1886.
†CHARLES KENDALL ADAMS, LL. D., 1884–1888.
†WILLIAM FREDERICK POOLE, LL. D., 1886–1887.
†JOHN JAY, LL. D., 1887–1889.
†WILLIAM WIRT HENRY, LL. D., 1888–1890.
†JAMES BURRILL ANGELL, LL. D., 1889–1891.
†HENRY ADAMS, LL D., 1890–1893.
†EDWARD GAY MASON, A. M., 1891–1894.
†GEORGE FRISBIE HOAR, LL. D., 1894.
†RICHARD SALTER STORRS, D. D., LL. D., 1895.
†JAMES SCHOULER, LL. D., 1895–1896.
†GEORGE PARK FISHER, D. D., LL. D., 1896–1897.
JAMES FORD RHODES, LL. D., D. LITT., 1897–1898.
†EDWARD EGGLESTON, L. H. D., 1898–1899.
†MOSES COIT TYLER, L. H. D., LL. D., 1899–1900.

†CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, LL. D., 1900.
†HERBERT BAXTER ADAMS, PH. D., LL. D., 1901.
†ALFRED THAYER MAHAN, D. C. L., LL. D., 1901.
†HENRY CHARLES LEA, LL. D., 1902.
†GOLDWIN SMITH, D. C. L., LL. D., 1902-1903.
†EDWARD McCRADY, LL. D., 1903.
JOHN BACH McMASTER, PH. D., LITT. D., LL. D., 1904.
SIMEON E. BALDWIN, LL. D., 1904-1905.
J. FRANKLIN JAMESON, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D., 1905-1906.
GEORGE BURTON ADAMS, PH. D., LITT. D., 1906-1907.
ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D., 1907-1908.
FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D., 1908-1909.
WILLIAM MILLIGAN SLOANE, PH. D., L. H. D., LL. D., 1909-1910.
†THEODORE ROOSEVELT, LL. D., D. C. L., 1910-1911.
WILLIAM ARCHIBALD DUNNING, PH. D., LL. D., 1911-1912.
ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN, A. M., LL. B., LL. D., 1912-1913.
†H. MORSE STEPHENS, M. A., LITT. D., 1913-1914.
GEORGE LINCOLN BURR, LL. D., 1914-1915.
WORTHINGTON C. FORD, A. M., 1915-1916.
WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER, LL. D., LITT. D., L. H. D., 1916-1917.
EDWARD CHANNING, PH. D., 1917-1919.
JEAN JULES JUSSERAND, F. B. A., 1918-1920.

SECRETARIES

†HERBERT BAXTER ADAMS, PH. D., LL. D., 1884-1900.
†A. HOWARD CLARK, A. M., 1889-1908.
CHARLES HOMER HASKINS, PH. D., 1900-1913.
WALDO GIFFORD LELAND, A. M., 1908-1919.
EVARTS BOUTELL GREENE, PH. D., 1914-1919.
JOHN SPENCER BASSETT, PH. D., 1919-

TREASURERS

CLARENCE WINTHROP BOWEN, PH. D., 1884-1917.
CHARLES MOORE, PH. D., 1917-

CURATOR

†A. HOWARD CLARK, A. M., 1889-1918.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

†WILLIAM BABCOCK WEEDEN, A. M., 1884-1886.
†CHARLES DEANE, LL. D., 1884-1887.
†MOSES COIT TYLER, L. H. D., LL. D., 1884-1885.
EPHRAIM EMERTON, PH. D., 1884-1885.
FRANKLIN BOWDITCH DEXTER, A. M., LITT. D., 1885-1887.
†WILLIAM FRANCIS ALLEN, A. M., 1885-1887.
†WILLIAM WIRT HENRY, LL. D., 1886-1888.
†RUTHERFORD BIRCHARD HAYES, LL. D., 1887-1888.
JOHN W. BURGESS, PH. D., LL. D., 1887-1891.
†ARTHUR MARTIN WHEELER, A. M., LL. D., 1887-1889.
†GEORGE PARK FISHER, D. D., LL. D., 1888-1891.
†GEORGE BROWN GOODE, LL. D., 1889-1896.
JOHN GEORGE BOURINOT, C. M. G., D. C. L., LL. D., 1889-1894.
JOHN BACH McMASTER, PH. D., LITT. D., LL. D., 1891-1894.
GEORGE BURTON ADAMS, PH. D., LITT. D., 1891-1897; 1898-1901.
†THEODORE ROOSEVELT, LL. D., D. C. L., 1894-1895.
†JABEZ LAMAR MONROE CURRY, LL. D., 1894-1895.
†H. MORSE STEPHENS, M. A., LITT. D., 1895-1899.
FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D., 1895-1899; 1901-1904.
†EDWARD MINOR GALLAUDET, PH. D., LL. D., 1896-1897.
†MELVILLE WESTON FULLER, LL. D., 1897-1900.
ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, PH. D., LITT. D., 1897-1900.
ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN, A. M., LL. B., LL. D., 1898-1901; 1903-1906.
WILLIAM ARCHIBALD DUNNING, PH. D., LL. D., 1899-1902.
†PETER WHITE, A. M., 1899-1902.

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D., 1900-1903.
A. LAWRENCE LOWELL, PH. D., LL. D., 1900-1903.
HERBERT PUTNAM, LITT. D., LL. D., 1901-1904.
GEORGE LINCOLN BURR, LL. D., 1902-1905.
EDWARD POTTS CHEYNEY, LL. D., 1902-1905
†EDWARD G. BOURNE, PH. D., 1903-1906.
†GEORGE P. GARRISON, PH. D., 1904-1907.
†REUBEN GOLD THWAITES, LL. D., 1904-1907.
CHARLES McLEAN ANDREWS, PH. D., L. H. D., 1905-1908.
JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON, PH. D., 1905-1908.
WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD, A. M., 1906-1909.
WILLIAM MACDONALD, PH. D., LL. D., 1906-1909.
MAX FARRAND, PH. D., 1907-1910.
FRANK HEYWOOD HODDER, PH. M., 1907-1910.
EVARTS BOUTELL GREENE, PH. D., 1908-1911.
CHARLES HENRY HULL, PH. D., 1908-1911.
FRANKLIN LAFAYETTE RILEY, A. M., PH. D., 1909-1912.
EDWIN ERLE SPARKS, PH. D., LL. D., 1909-1912.
JAMES ALBERT WOODBURN, PH. D., LL. D., 1910-1913.
FRED MORROW FLING, PH. D., 1910-1913.
HERMAN VANDENBURG AMES, PH. D., 1911-1914.
DANA CARLETON MUNRO, A. M., 1911-1914.
ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE, PH. D., 1912-1914.
JOHN MARTIN VINCENT, PH. D., LL. D., 1912-1915
FREDERIC BANCROFT, PH. D., LL. D., 1913-1915.
CHARLES HOMER HASKINS, PH. D., 1913-1916.
EUGENE C. BARKER, PH. D., 1914-1917.
GUY S. FORD, B. L., PH. D., 1914-1917.
ULRICH B. PHILLIPS, PH. D., 1914-1917.
LUCY M. SALMON, A. M., L. H. D., 1915-1919.
SAMUEL B. HARDING, PH. D., 1915-1919.
HENRY E. BOURNE, A. B., B. D., L. H. D., 1916-1920.
CHARLES MOORE, PH. D., 1916-1917.
GEORGE M. WRONG, M. A., 1916-1920.
HERBERT E. BOLTON, B. L., PH. D., 1917-1920.
WILLIAM E. DODD, PH. D., 1917-1920.
WALTER L. FLEMING, M. S., PH. D., 1917-1920.
WILLIAN E. LINGELBACH, PH. D., 1917-1920.
JAMES T. SHOTWELL, PH. D., 1919-
RUTH PUTNAM, B. LITT., 1919-
ARTHUR L. CROSS, PH. D., 1920-
SIDNEY B. FAY, PH. D., 1920-
CARL RUSSELL FISH, PH. D., 1920-
CARLTON J. H. HAYES, PH. D., 1920-
FREDERIC L. PAXSON, PH. D., 1920-
ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT, PH. D., 1920-

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES 1921

OFFICERS

President.—Jean Jules Jusserand, the French Embassy, Washington, D. C.

First vice president.—Charles H. Haskins, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Second vice president.—Edward P. Cheyney, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Secretary.—John S. Bassett, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

Treasurer.—Charles Moore, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Assistant secretary-treasurer.—Patty W. Washington, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

Editor.—Allen R. Boyd, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(in addition to above)

Elected members.—Arthur L. Cross, 705 South State Street, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Sidney B. Fay, 32 Paradise Road, Northampton, Mass.; Carl Russell Fish, 244 Lake Lawn Place, Madison, Wis.; Carlton J. H. Hayes, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Frederic L. Paxson, 2122 Van Hise Avenue, Madison, Wis.; Ruth Putnam, 2025 O Street NW., Washington, D. C.; James T. Shotwell, 407 West One hundred and seventeenth Street, New York, N. Y.; St. George L. Sioussat, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Ex-presidents.—James Ford Rhodes, 392 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.; John Bach McMaster, 2109 Delancy Place, Philadelphia, Pa.; Simeon E. Baldwin, 69 Church Street, New Haven, Conn.; J. Franklin Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; George Burton Adams, 57 Edgehill Road, New Haven, Conn.; Albert Bushnell Hart, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Frederick J. Turner, 7 Phillips Place, Cambridge, Mass.; William M. Sloane, Princeton, N. J.; William A. Dunning, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.; Andrew C. McLaughlin, University of Chicago, Chicago Ill.; George L. Burr, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.; Worthington C. Ford, 1154 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.; William Roscoe Thayer, 8 Berkeley Street, Cambridge, Mass.; Edward Channing, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

STANDING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL

Committee on agenda.—Charles H. Haskins, chairman (ex officio); Jean Jules Jusserand, Edward P. Cheyney (ex officio), John S. Bassett (ex officio), Charles Moore (ex officio), Arthur L. Cross, Sidney B. Fay, Carlton J. H. Hayes, Frederic L. Paxson.

Committee on meetings and relations.—John S. Bassett, chairman; Edward Channing, Carl Russell Fish, James T. Shotwell, Ruth Putnam.

Committee on finance.—Charles Moore, chairman; John S. Bassett, Sidney B. Fay, Frederic L. Paxson, St. George L. Sioussat.

Committee on appointments.—Jean Jules Jusserand, chairman; John S. Bassett, Edward P. Cheyney, Carl Russell Fish, Carlton J. H. Hayes.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES TO REPORT TO THE COUNCIL

Committee on disposition of records.—Waldo G. Leland, chairman, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; H. Barrett Learned, 2123 Bancroft Place, Washington, D. C.; C. O. Paullin, 1025 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Committee to formulate rules for the George L. Beer prize.—William A. Dunning, chairman, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Marshall S. Brown, 19 Fairview Street, Yonkers, N. Y.; Edward S. Corwin, 115 Prospect Avenue, Princeton, N. J.

Committee on nominations.—Frank H. Hodder, chairman, 1115 Louisiana Street, Lawrence, Kans.; Henry E. Bourne, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio; William E. Dodd, 5757 Blackstone Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; Eloise Ellery, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; William E. Lingelbach, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE ASSOCIATION

Committee on program for the thirty-sixth annual meeting.—Evarts B. Greene, chairman, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. (appointed for one year); Charles Seymour, 127 Everit Street, New Haven, Conn. (appointed for two years); Walter L. Fleming, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. (appointed for three years); Thomas M. Marshall, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.; Norman M. Trenholme, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. Ex officio: Nils Andreas Olsen, secretary of the Agricultural History Society, Bureau of Farm Management, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.; John C. Parish, secretary of the Conference of Historical Societies, State Historical Society of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

Committee on local arrangements, thirty-sixth annual meeting.—William K. Bixby, chairman, Kings Highway and Lindell Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.; Mrs. Nettie H. Beauregard, Jefferson Memorial Building, St. Louis, Mo.; Ralph P. Bieber, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.; Stella M. Drumm, Jefferson Memorial Building, St. Louis, Mo.: David R. Francis, 214 North Fourth Street, St. Louis, Mo.; Benjamin Gratz, Rialto Building, St. Louis, Mo.; John H. Gundlach, 3615 North Broadway, St. Louis, Mo.; Breckinridge Jones, 45 Portland Place, St. Louis, Mo.; Mrs. Robert McKittrick Jones, 6 Westmoreland Place, St. Louis, Mo.; Breckinridge Long, 5145 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.; Mrs. N. A. McMillan, 23 Portland Place, St. Louis, Mo.; Thomas M. Marshall, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.; Charles P. Pettus, American Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo.; George R. Throop, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Board of editors of the American Historical Review.—J. Franklin Jameson, managing editor, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C. (term expires 1925); Guy Stanton Ford, chairman, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. (1926); Archibald C. Coolidge, 4 Randolph Hall, Cambridge, Mass. (1924); Williston Walker, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (1923); Carl Becker, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. (1922); Claude H. Van Tyne, 1942 Cambridge Road, Ann Arbor, Mich. (1921).

Historical manuscripts commission.—Justin H. Smith, chairman, 7 West Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y.; Annie H. Abel, 811 North M Street, Aberdeen, Wash., Eugene C. Barker, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.; Robert P. Brooks, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.; Logan Esarey, Bloomington, Ind.; Gaillard Hunt, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

Committee on the Justin Winsor prize—Clive Day, chairman, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; Isaac J. Cox, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.; Thomas F. Moran, Purdue University, West La Fayette, Ind.; Bernard C. Steiner, Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, Md.; William W. Sweet, 632 East Washington Street, Greencastle, Ind.

Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize.—Conyers Read, chairman, 1218 Snyder Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.; Charles H. McIlwain, 19 Francis Avenue, Cam-

bridge, Mass.; David S. Muzzey, 492 Van Cortlandt Park Avenue, Yonkers, N. Y. Nellie Neilson, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.; Bernadotte E. Schmitt, 1938 East One hundred and sixteenth Street, Cleveland, Ohio; Wilbur H. Siebert, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Committee on publications (all ex officio except the chairman).—H. Barrett Learned, chairman, 2123 Bancroft Place, Washington, D. C.; Allen R. Boyd, secretary, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.; John S. Bassett, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; J. Franklin Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Justin H. Smith, 7 West Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y.; Rodney H. True, secretary Agricultural History Society, Macfarlane Hall of Botany, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Committee on membership.—Thomas J. Wertenbaker, chairman, 111 Fitz Randolph Road, Princeton, N. J.; Louise Fargo Brown, 263 Mill Street, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Eugene H. Byrne, 240 Lake Lawn Place, Madison, Wis.; A. C. Krey, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Frank E. Melvin, 737 Maine Street, Lawrence, Kans.; Richard A. Newhall, 353 Ellsworth Avenue, New Haven, Conn.; Charles W. Ramsdell, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.; Arthur P. Scott, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; J. J. Van Nostrand, jr., University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; James E. Winston, Sophie Newcomb College, New Orleans, La.; George F. Zook, Bureau of Education, Washington, D. C. Associate members: Milledge L. Bonham, jr., Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.; Henry E. Bourne, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio; Julian P. Bretz, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.; Robert P. Brooks, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.; Sarah A. Dynes, State Normal School, Trenton, N. J.; Austin P. Evans, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; J. Montgomery Gambrill, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Sheldon J. Howe, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.; M. Berna Hunt, 127 Summit Avenue, Jersey City, N. J.; Laurence M. Larson, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.; John H. Logan, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.; Margaret J. Mitchell, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.; Laurence B. Packard, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.; George Petrie, Auburn, Ala.; Walter Prichard, Baton Rouge, La.; Charles H. Rammelkamp, Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.; Morgan P. Robinson, 113 South Third Street, Richmond, Va.; Louis M. Sears, Purdue University, West La Fayette, Ind.; Augustus H. Shearer, the Grosvenor Library, Buffalo, N. Y.; Earl E. Sperry, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.; David Y. Thomas, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.; Frederic L. Thompson, 63 South Pleasant Street, Amherst, Mass.; Norman M. Trenholme, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.; James A. Woodburn, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.; Jesse E. Wrench, 1815 University Avenue, Columbia, Mo.; John P. Wynne, Agricultural College, Miss.

Conference of historical societies.—George S. Godard, chairman,[1] Connecticut State Library, Hartford, Conn.; John C. Parish, secretary State Historical Society of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

COMMITTEES APPOINTED BY THE CONFERENCE

Committee on bibliography of historical societies.—Joseph Schafer, chairman, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; Julius H. Tuttle, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, Mass.; A. P. C. Griffin, Chief Assistant Librarian, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Committee on handbook of historical societies.—George N. Fuller, secretary of Michigan Historical Commission, Lansing, Mich.; Solon J. Buck, superintendent of Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul, Minn.; John C. Parish, State Historical Society of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

Committee on national archives.—J. Franklin Jameson, chairman, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington D. C.; Charles Moore, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.; Col. Oliver L. Spaulding, jr., United States Army, Chief of Historical Branch, General Staff, Washington, D. C.

[1] Elected at the business meeting of the conference of historical societies.

Committee on bibliography.—George M. Dutcher, chairman, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.; William H. Allison, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.; Sidney B. Fay, 32 Paradise Road, Northampton, Mass.; Augustus H. Shearer, the Grosvenor Library, Buffalo, N. Y.; Henry R. Shipman, 27 Mercer Street, Princeton, N. J.

Subcommittee on the bibliography of American travel.—Solon J. Buck, Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul, Minn.; M. M. Quaife, State Historical Library, Madison, Wis.; Benjamin F. Shambaugh, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

Public archives commission.—Victor H. Paltsits, chairman, 48 Whitson Street, Forest Hills Gardens, Long Island, N. Y.; Solon J. Buck, Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul, Minn.; R. D. W. Connor, North Carolina Historical Commission, Raleigh, N. C.; Waldo G. Leland, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Arnold J. F. van Laer, 433 Western Avenue, Albany, N. Y.

Committee on obtaining transcripts from foreign archives.—J. Franklin Jameson, chairman, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Charles M. Andrews, 424 St. Ronan Street, New Haven, Conn.; Waldo G. Leland, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

Committee on military history.—Brig. Gen. Eben Swift, United States Army, retired, chairman, 1823 Nineteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Allen R. Boyd, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.; R. B. House, North Carolina Historical Commission, Raleigh, N. C.; Eben Putnam, Wellesley Farms, Mass.; Col. Oliver L. Spaulding, jr., United States Army, Chief of Historical Branch, General Staff, Washington, D. C.

Committee on hereditary patriotic societies.—Dixon R. Fox, chairman, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Natalie S. Lincoln, editor D. A. R., Memorial Continental Hall, Washington, D. C.; Harry Brent Mackoy, Covington, Ky.; Mrs. Annie L. Sioussat, Arundel Club, Baltimore, Md.; R. C. Ballard Thruston, 1000 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.

Committee on service.—J. Franklin Jameson, chairman, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Elbert J. Benton, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio; Clarence S. Brigham, American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Mass.; Worthington C. Ford, Massachusetts Historical Society, 1154 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.; Arthur C. Howland, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; Albert E. McKinley, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; James Sullivan, State Education Building, Albany, N. Y.

Board of editors of The Historical Outlook.—Albert E. McKinley, managing editor, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; Edgar Dawson, Hunter College, New York, N. Y.; Sarah A. Dynes, State Normal School, Trenton, N. J.; Daniel C. Knowlton, the Lincoln School, 646 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Laurence M. Larson, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.; William L. Westermann, 116 Schuyler Place, Ithaca, N. Y.

Committee on history teaching in the schools.—Henry Johnson, chairman, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Henry E. Bourne, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio; Philip P. Chase, 241 Highland Street, Milton, Mass.; Guy Stanton Ford, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Daniel C. Knowlton, the Lincoln School, 646 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Albert E. McKinley, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; Eugene M. Violette, Kirksville, Mo.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE ASSOCIATION

Committee on bibliography of modern English history.—Edward P. Cheyney, chairman, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; Arthur L. Cross, 705 South State Street, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Roger B. Merriman, 175 Brattle Street, Cambridge, Mass.; Wallace Notestein, 237 Goldwin Smith Hall, Ithaca, N. Y.; Conyers Read, 1218 Snyder Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.

Committee on the historical congress at Rio de Janeiro.—Bernard Moses, honorary chairman, care London Co. and Westminster Bank, 22 Place Vendome, Paris, France; Percy A. Martin, acting chairman, Leland Stanford Junior University, Stanford University, Calif.; Julius Klein, secretary, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.; Charles Lyon Chandler, Corn Exchange National Bank, Philadelphia, Pa.; Charles H. Cunningham, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.; Manoel de Oliveira Lima, 3536 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Edwin V. Morgan, American Embassy, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; Constantine E. McGuire, Inter-American High Commission, Washington, D. C.; William L. Schurz, 606 East Ann Street, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Committee on the documentary historical publications of the United States.—J. Franklin Jameson, chairman, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Charles Moore, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Committee on the writing of history.—Ambassador Jean Jules Jusserand, chairman, French Embassy, Washington, D. C.; Charles W. Colby, 253 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Wilbur C. Abbott, 219 Livingston Street, New Haven, Conn.

Committee to cooperate with the Peoples of America Society in the study of race elements in the United States.—John S. Bassett, chairman; Frederic L. Paxson.

ORGANIZATION AND ACTIVITIES

The American Historical Association is the national organization for the promotion of historical writing and studies in the United States. It was founded in 1884 by a group of representative scholars, and in 1889 was chartered by Congress. Its national character is emphasized by fixing its principal office in Washington and by providing for the publication of its annual reports by the United States Government through the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. The membership of the association, at present about 2,500, is drawn from every State in the Union, as well as from Canada and South America. It includes representatives of all the professions and many of the various business and commercial pursuits. To all who desire to promote the development of history—local, national, or general—and to all who believe that a correct knowledge of the past is essential to a right understanding of the present the association makes a strong appeal through its publications and other activities.

The meetings of the association are held annually during the last week in December in cities so chosen as to accommodate in turn the members living in different parts of the country, and the average attendance is about 400. The meetings afford an opportunity for members to become personally acquainted and to discuss matters in which they have a common interest.

The principal publications of the association are the annual report and the American Historical Review. The former, usually in two volumes, is printed for the association by the Government and is distributed free to all members who desire it. It contains the proceedings of the association, including the more important papers read at the annual meetings, as well as valuable collections of documents, edited by the historical manuscripts commission; reports on American archives, prepared by the public archives commission; bibliographical contributions; reports on history teaching, on the activities of historical societies, and other agencies, etc.; and an annual group of papers on agricultural history contributed by the Agricultural History Society. The American Historical Review is the official organ of the association and the recognized organ of the historical profession in the United States. It is published quarterly, each number containing about 200 pages. It presents to the reader authoritative articles, critical reviews of important new works on history, notices of inedited documents, and the news of all other kinds of historical activities. The Review is indispensable to all who wish to keep abreast of the progress of historical scholarship, and is of much value and interest to the general reader. It is distributed free to all members of the association.

For the encouragement of historical research the association offers two biennial prizes, each of $200, for the best printed or manuscript monograph in the English language submitted by a writer residing in the Western Hemisphere who has not achieved an established reputation. The Justin Winsor prize, offered in the even years, is awarded to an essay in the history of the Western Hemisphere, including the insular possessions of the United States. In odd years the Herbert Baxter Adams prize is awarded for an essay in the history of the Eastern Hemisphere.

To the subject of history teaching the association has devoted much and consistent attention through conferences held at the annual meetings, the investigations of committees, and the preparation of reports. The association appoints the board of

editors of The Historical Outlook, thus assuming a certain responsibility for that valuable organ of the history-teaching profession. At the close of the war a special committee was appointed on the revision of the historical program in all schools under college grade.

The association maintains close relations with the State and local historical societies through a conference organized under the auspices of the association and holding a meeting each year in connection with the annual meeting of the association. In this meeting of delegates the various societies discuss such problems as the collection and editing of historical material, the maintenance of museums and libraries, the fostering of popular interest in historical matters, the marking of sites, the observance of historical anniversaries, etc. The proceedings of the conference are printed in the annual reports of the association.

The Pacific Coast Branch of the association, organized in 1904, affords an opportunity for the members living in the Far West to have meetings and an organization of their own while retaining full membership in the parent body. In 1915 the association met with the branch in San Francisco, Berkeley, and Palo Alto in celebration of the opening of the Panama Canal. The proceedings of this meeting, devoted to the history of the Pacific and the countries about it, have been published in a separate volume.

From the first the association has pursued the policy of inviting to its membership not only those professionally or otherwise actively engaged in historical work, but also those whose interest in history or in the advancement of historical science is such that they wish to ally themselves with the association in the furtherance of its various objects. Thus the association counts among its members lawyers, clergymen, editors, publishers, physicians, officers of the Army and Navy, merchants, bankers, and farmers, all of whom find material of especial interest in the publications of the association.

Membership in the association is obtained through election by the executive council, upon nomination by a member or by direct application. The annual dues are $3, there being no initiation fee. The fee for life membership is $50, which secures exemption from all annual dues.

Inquiries respecting the association, its work, publications, prizes, meetings, memberships, etc., should be addressed to the assistant secretary of the association at 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C., from whom they will receive prompt attention.

HISTORICAL PRIZES

WINSOR AND ADAMS PRIZES

For the purpose of encouraging historical research, the American Historical Association offers two prizes, each prize of $200—the Justin Winsor prize in American history and the Herbert Baxter Adams prize in the history of the Eastern Hemisphere. The Winsor prize is offered in the even years (as heretofore), and the Adams prize in the odd years. Both prizes are designed to encourage writers who have not published previously any considerable work or obtained an established reputation. Either prize shall be awarded for an excellent monograph or essay, printed or in manuscript, submitted to or selected by the committee of award. Monographs must be submitted on or before July 1 of the given year. In the case of a printed monograph the date of publication must fall within a period of two years prior to July 1. A monograph to which a prize has been awarded in manuscript may, if it is deemed in all respects available, be published in the annual report of the association. Competition shall be limited to monographs written or published in the English language by writers of the Western Hemisphere.

In making the award the committee will consider not only research, accuracy, and originality, but also clearness of expression and logical arrangement. The successful monograph must reveal marked excellence of style. Its subject matter should afford a distinct contribution to knowledge of a sort beyond that having merely personal or local interest. The monograph must conform to the accepted canons of historical research and criticism. A manuscript—including text, notes, bibliography, appendices, etc.—must not exceed 100,000 words if designed for publication in the annual report of the association.

The Justin Winsor prize.—The monograph must be based upon independent and original investigation in American history. The phrase "American history" includes the history of the United States and other countries of the Western Hemisphere. The monograph may deal with any aspect or phase of that history.

The Herbert Baxter Adams prize.—The monograph must be based upon independent and original investigation in the history of the Eastern Hemisphere. The monograph may deal with any aspect or phase of that history, as in the case of the Winsor prize.

Inquiries regarding these prizes should be addressed to the chairmen of the respective committees, or to the secretary of the association, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

The Justin Winsor prize (which until 1906 was offered annually) has been awarded to the following:

1896. Herman V. Ames: "The proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States."

1900. William A. Schaper: "Sectionalism and representation in South Carolina"; with honorable mention of Mary S. Locke: "Antislavery sentiment before 1808."

1901. Ulrich B. Phillips: "Georgia and State rights"; with honorable mention of M. Louise Green: "The struggle for religious liberty in Connecticut."

1902. Charles McCarthy: "The Anti-Masonic Party"; with honorable mention of W. Roy Smith: "South Carolina as a royal province."

1903. Louise Phelps Kellogg: "The American colonial charter: A study of its relation to English administration, chiefly after 1688."

1904. William R. Manning: "The Nootka Sound controversy"; with honorable mention of C. O. Paullin: "The Navy of the American Revolution."

1906. Annie Heloise Abel: "The history of events resulting in Indian consolidation west of the Mississippi River."

1908. Clarence Edwin Carter: "Great Britain and the Illinois country, 1765–1774"; with honorable mention of Charles Henry Ambler: "Sectionalism in Virginia, 1776–1861."

1910. Edward Raymond Turner: "The Negro in Pennsylvania: Slavery—servitude—freedom, 1639–1861."

1912. Arthur Charles Cole: "The Whig Party in the South."

1914. Mary W. Williams: "Anglo-American Isthmian diplomacy, 1815–1915."

1916. Richard J. Purcell: "Connecticut in transition, 1775–1818."

1918. Arthur M. Schlesinger: "The Colonial Merchants and the American Revolution, 1763–1776." (Columbia University Studies in History, etc., No. 182.)

From 1897 to 1899 and in 1905 the Justin Winsor prize was not awarded.

The Herbert Baxter Adams prize has been awarded to:

1905. David S. Muzzey: "The Spiritual Franciscans"; with honorable mention of Eloise Ellery: "Jean Pierre Brissot."

1907. In equal division, Edward B. Krehbiel, "The Interdict: Its history and its operation, with especial attention to the time of Pope Innocent III"; and William S. Robertson, "Francisco de Miranda and the revolutionizing of Spanish America."

1909. Wallace Notestein: "A history of witchcraft in England from 1558 to 1718."

1911. Louise Fargo Brown: "The political activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy men in England during the Interregnum."

1913. Violet Barbour: "Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington."

1915. Theodore C. Pease: "The leveller movement"; with honorable mention of F. C. Melvin: "Napoleon's system of licensed navigation, 1806–1814."

1917. Frederick L. Nussbaum: "G. J. A. Ducher: An essay on the political history of mercantilism during the French Revolution."

1919. Williams Thomas Morgan: "English political parties and leaders in the reign of Queen Anne, 1702–1710."

The essays of Messrs. Muzzey, Krehbiel, Carter, Notestein, Turner, Cole, Pease, Purcell, Miss Brown, Miss Barbour, and Miss Williams have been published by the association in a series of separate volumes. The earlier Winsor prize essays were printed in the annual reports.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION STATISTICS OF MEMBERSHIP

DECEMBER 15, 1920

I. General

Total membership	2,524
Life	106
Annual	2,202
Institutions	216
Total paid membership, including life members	2,074
Delinquent (total)	450
Since last bill	442
For one year	8
Loss (total)	206
Deaths	37
Resignations	64
Dropped	105
Gain (total)	285
Life	3
Annual	266
Institutions	16
Total number of elections	271
Net gain or loss	79

II. By Regions

New England: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut	403
North Atlantic: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia	774
South Atlantic: Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida	138
North Central: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin	507
South Central: Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky, West Virginia	74
West Central: Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas	289
Pacific coast: Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, Washington, Oregon, California	240
Territories: Porto Rico, Alaska, Hawaii, Philippine Islands	5
Other countries	94
	2,524

III. By States

	Members	New members, 1920		Members	New members, 1920
Alabama	12	5	New Jersey	69	4
Alaska	.....	.....	New Mexico	7	1
Arizona	6	1	New York	360	33
Arkansas	6	.....	North Carolina	28	5
California	139	21	North Dakota	8	2
Colorado	18	3	Ohio	125	26
Connecticut	88	6	Oklahoma	14	3
Delaware	11	2	Oregon	18	3
District of Columbia	105	14	Pennsylvania	172	12
Florida	6	.....	Philippine Islands	3	.....
Georgia	22	5	Porto Rico	2	.....
Hawaii	.....	.....	Rhode Island	21	.....
Idaho	7	1	South Carolina	18	1
Illinois	178	16	South Dakota	12	3
Indiana	54	7	Tennessee	17	4
Iowa	46	4	Texas	45	2
Kansas	28	4	Utah	8	2
Kentucky	22	1	Vermont	11	4
Louisiana	15	2	Virginia	64	18
Maine	13	1	Washington	23	1
Maryland	57	7	West Virginia	19	3
Massachusetts	242	17	Wisconsin	63	6
Michigan	87	15	Wyoming	3	.....
Minnesota	50	6	Canada	31	2
Mississippi	4	.....	Cuba	2	.....
Missouri	43	2	South America	5	.....
Montana	6	1	Foreign	56	6
Nebraska	22	1			
Nevada	5	.....	Total	2,524	285
New Hampshire	28	2			

I. PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRTY-FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Washington, D. C., December 27-30, 1920

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION AT WASHINGTON, D. C.[1]

Counting 2 meetings which where held partly in Washington and partly in Baltimore, Md., and Richmond, Va., respectively, 12 of the 35 annual meetings of the American Historical Association have been held in the National Capital—that of 1886, presided over by the venerable George Bancroft, and those of 1888–1891, inclusive, of 1894 and 1895, of 1901, 1905, 1908, 1915, and 1920. The act of January 4, 1889, incorporating the society, provides that it shall have its principal office at Washington, though it may hold its annual meetings where it pleases. Other provisions of the act, concerning relations with the Smithsonian Institution, emphasize the Washington connection, and the association is always entitled to consider itself more distinctly at home in Washington than in any other city, and to meet there without specific invitation, though always assured of cordial welcome by the resident members. Under such circumstances, if the resident members are obliged to feel that they have done less for the entertainment of their fellow members on occasion of the annual meeting than has been done in some other cities, they console themselves with the reflection that Washington is the society's legal home, that every citizen of the United States has his or her share in its ownership, and that the city has many intrinsic attractions of its own, independent of whatever pleasures might be devised to accompany a professional gathering of historical scholars. Not the least of these attractions is a winter climate milder than that of most of the cities where the association has met; but there are also the buildings and other sights of Washington, and, an attraction having especial drawing power for historians, the printed and manuscript treasures of the Library of Congress and the archives—if in their present condition they deserve to be called archives—of the National Government.

By whatever attractions drawn, the number of members attending the thirty-fifth meeting, December 28–30, 1920, was much greater than had been expected. At the Washington meeting of 1915 the registration was 430; but railroad fares have grown higher since then, teachers poorer. Moreover, the railroads proved as unwilling this year as the United States Railroad Administration had been in the year preceding to make any concessions as to reduction of railroad fares for such

[1] This account of the Washington meeting is taken, with some modifications and abridgments, from the American Historical Review for April, 1921.

an occasion. They could not be persuaded to class the American Historical Association's meeting among "meetings of religious, educational, charitable, fraternal, or military character." Most members, it is hoped, found the meeting both educational and fraternal; at all events, members came in unexpected numbers. The registration amounted to 360. The other societies meeting at the same time—the American Political Science Association, the American Sociological Society, the American Catholic Historical Association, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, and the Agricultural History Society—also had gratifying numbers registering. The subscription dinner, in which all the societies joined, had an attendance of 300, and the breakfast conferences and luncheon conferences for informal discussion of themes or projects asssumed to have a special interest for merely a limited number of members had on this occasion so embarrassing a number of attendants that at meetings hereafter held it will seem difficult to combine the feeding of the multitude with preaching of the word.

The subscription dinner deserves a special comment. Such functions are expensive, and the association had seldom ventured to have them; but this particular dinner, a joint affair of all the societies, amply justified itself. No one who heard the incisive remarks of the French Ambassador on historical processes and modern events, or the Secretary of War's penetrating and brilliant discussion of the relation of history to the Great War, or Dr. J. J. Walsh's witty speech on historical assumptions respecting progress, is likely ever to forget the occasion. Doctor Walsh spoke as representative of the American Catholic Historical Association, of which he had that day been elected president. Others who spoke were Dr. Paul S. Reinsch, president of the American Political Science Association, and Dr. Edward A. Ross for the American Sociological Society. At the beginning, graceful words of welcome on behalf of the municipal government were spoken by Miss Mabel Boardman, one of the Commissioners for the District of Columbia.

Other occasions on which there was union of societies were the joint session with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, presided over by the president of that society, Prof. Chauncey S. Boucher, of the University of Texas; the joint session with the Agricultural History Society, at which its president, Dr. Rodney H. True, of the Department of Agriculture, acted as chairman; and three joint sessions with the American Political Science Association. The first of these three was the occasion when the presidents of the two societies delivered their annual addresses, Dr. Herbert Putnam, Librarian of Congress, presiding. The thoughtful address of Prof. Edward Channing, of Harvard, as president of the American Historical Association,

entitled "An historical retrospect," was printed in the January (1921) issue of the Review. The address of Doctor Reinsch was entitled "Secret diplomacy: How far can it be eliminated?"

The second of these joint sessions was concerned with Pan American political and diplomatic relations, and was held, appropriately, under the chairmanship of Dr. Leo S. Rowe, the new Director of the Pan American Union, and in the Union's beautiful building (nearly all other meetings were held in the New Willard Hotel, the association's headquarters). In both this session and the luncheon conference on the history of Latin America, which preceded it, the same tendency was noticeable that has been seen on previous occasions when the association has made provision for the consideration of Hispanic American history, the tendency, namely, to turn away from that history to the consideration of present-day problems of the mutual relations between the Latin American Republics and the United States. The truth is that while interest in these present relations is acute and extensive, and while the history of those portions of the present United States that were once under Spain is being cultivated with exceptional ardor, the historical study of the regions to the southward of our boundaries is still in its infancy among us.

The third of these joint sessions occurred on the last evening, when, under the chairmanship of Baron Korff, formerly of the University of Helsingfors but now of Washington, papers were read on aspects of recent European history and politics. At the close of the session, Baron Korff in graceful words expressed thanks on behalf of the association to the committees who had been in charge of the meeting and to those who, as hosts, had entertained the members. In the Historical Association, the chairman of the committee of local arrangements was Dr. H. Barrett Learned, the secretary Dr. George F. Zook, of the Bureau of Education. The chairman of the committee on the program was Prof. Carlton J. H. Hayes, of Columbia University. The entertainments included a "smoker" at the Cosmos Club, an evening reception by the National Club House Committee of the Association of Collegiate Alumnæ, and a most pleasant afternoon reception at the French Embassy by Ambassador and Madame Jusserand.

The "luncheon conferences" were four. One was composed, as has already been mentioned, of persons chiefly interested in Latin America; another of those interested in the history of the Far East; another was devoted, with excellent results, to practical considerations respecting the study and teaching of economic history. In this conference formal papers were read. Prof. Clive Day, of Yale University, who presided, spoke on the recognition of economic history as a distinct subject, reviewing its history, and discriminating between those elementary courses in which its fusion with general history is desirable

and those more advanced stages of instruction to which separate and special courses are more appropriate. Prof. Abbott P. Usher, of the School of Business Administration in Boston University, spoke on the field for the teaching of economic history in colleges and secondary schools. It appears that in most colleges and universities where economic history finds a place the chief provision for it consists in a course which gives one semester to the economic history of Europe and one to that of America. Many difficulties, especially in the intricate subjects of medieval agriculture and commerce, are avoided by beginning the European part of the course with the Industrial Revolution, but such a procedure sacrifices too much of what is stimulating to the student, to whom the contrast between medieval and modern conditions, medieval and modern forms of social organization, especially in the field of industry, is sure to be highly instructive. Within the last few years economic history has become an important subject in the curricula of business schools, especially their undergraduate divisions, now rapidly growing. Here, little other history can be taught; economic history must give elementary training in both historical and statistical method, and must be coordinated with the work descriptive of industries and, in general, of present-day economic organization. The speaker doubted the wisdom of trying to extend economic history into the field of secondary and vocational education.

In the same conference, Professor Hayes, of Columbia University, spoke on the relation of courses in economic history to courses in history and in economics, respectively; Prof. Frank T. Carlton, of De Pauw University, on the history of labor as a field for historical research, with especial emphasis on the need for comparative study of the structure and operation of different types of labor organizations, considered as social forces.

Much the most numerously attended of these luncheon conferences was that which was concerned with the opportunities for historical research in Washington. By the courtesy of the Librarian of Congress, it took place in the Library. The circumstances confined the speakers—Dr. Gaillard Hunt, of the Department of State, Mr. Charles Moore, chief of the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress, Mr. Theodore Belote, curator of American history in the National Museum, and Prof. Frederick J. Turner—to the elements of the subject, but it was impressive and most gratifying to see the eager interest with which their hearers, mostly young graduate students, absorbed these elements of knowledge and incitement concerning the historical treasures of Washington. Would that some adequate appreciation of the opportunities presented here might be diffused among the members of the historical profession, and all others who are interested in history! How do they escape the knowledge that

Washington is far the best place for the study of most of the really important parts of American history? Certainly no city in the world so richly provided with historical materials is so little resorted to for purposes of historical writing. From a country of such enormous wealth, there should be, outside the number of those who earn their living in Washington by the teaching of history or other historical work, and the occasional professors who come on leave of absence, at least 50 scholars able to vivere suo who have settled down in Washington to lead the historical student's life and exploit this wonderfully opulent mass of material. There are not five. But apparently the well-to-do young American, though nowadays he goes or is sent to college, seldom acquires from either parents or teachers the conviction that there is an inviting career in further study. He is not found in the graduate school. Yet historical writing has never been a poor man's pursuit, but always a pursuit of the well-to-do or the endowed—and in America, with no Congregation of St. Maur, the endowed class has embraced only professors of history, and them only in the happy years from 1880 to 1914, when professors still had some free time!

But to return to the meeting. Before proceeding to those papers which can best be taken into consideration individually, one should speak of two sessions which had more the character of "experience meetings," or of free conferences unencumbered by meals, than of assemblages for the reading of formal papers—the usual annual meeting of the Conference of Historical Societies and the conference which met to discuss the report of the committee on history and education for citizenship in the schools. The former, presided over by Dr. James Sullivan, State historian of New York, was given the shape of a joint meeting of the representatives of historical societies and of the National Association of State War History Organizations. For the latter body, which now embraces some 15 of the organizations which States have formed for the collection and preservation of their records of service in the Great War, Mr. Karl Singewald, of the historical division of the Maryland Council of Defense, presented a report of "Progress in the collection of war records by State war history organizations"; Prof. Albert E. McKinley, secretary of the Pennsylvania War History Commission, a paper of "Suggestions and plans for State and local publications of war history." The materials chiefly collected are, first, the service records of individuals; secondly, other military records, such as histories of units, diaries, rosters, photographs, etc.; thirdly, various materials relating to economic participation in the war, and to welfare and morale work. The projected publications correspond—histories of military participation, histories of economic effort, histories of the welfare movements.

In respect to the work of historical societies, the main subject was that of cooperation of societies within the individual State. Dr. Joseph Schafer, superintendent of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, described the intensive survey of the settlement of that State which is being carried on by the cooperative efforts of that society and of the local historical societies, and to which has been given the appropriate title of the Wisconsin Domesday Book; Dr. Worthington C. Ford and Dr. James Sullivan described, respectively, the work of the Bay State Historical League in Massachusetts, and of the various county and regional federations of historical societies in New York, and dwelt upon the stimulus given to local societies by the contacts afforded by these groupings.

At the close of the session the conference of historical societies, which enjoys a certain autonomy under the auspices of the association, held its annual business meeting. Mr. George S. Godard was reelected chairman for the present year and two special committees were appointed, one to publish, if possible, a handbook of historical societies, the other to consider a continuation of the bibliography of historical societies compiled to 1905 by Mr. A. P. C. Griffin and printed as Volume II of the annual report of the association for that year. Dr. Dunbar Rowland made a report as chairman of the committee appointed by the conference in 1907, on cooperation among American historical societies and State departments of history. The project undertaken by the committee, namely, the calendaring of all documents in Parisian archives relating to the Mississippi Valley, for which the societies and departments of that region had raised a fund of $3,000, has been substantially completed, so far as the gathering of material for it is concerned. Doctor Rowland recommended that the offer of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington to edit and publish the calendar be accepted and that the special committee be discharged. This recommendation was adopted.

The committee on history and education for citizenship in the schools was constituted in 1918, first by the National Board for Historical Service and later by the association, in order to consider those extensive modifications in the methods of historical teaching in schools which, it was then felt, must be brought about as a result of the Great War, in order that history might do its full part in training the minds of the young for proper service to a new era. The history of the committee's work may be traced in these pages and in those of the Historical Outlook, where also preliminary reports from it have been printed.[2] Many obstacles have delayed the presentation of its final report. The object of the present conference

[2] See American Historical Review, XXIV, 351-353, 746; XXV, 372-373; Historical Outlook, X, 273-281, 349-351, 448-451; XI, 73-83, 111-115.

was the discussion of portions of its proposals, already made known by some of its previous publications.

In the first of the two formal addresses presented, both of them by members of the committee, Prof. Henry Johnson, of Teachers College, Columbia University, discussed the questions of "Local and American history in grades II–VI" and "World history in the high school." He described three groups of dominant ideas respecting the aims and subject matter of history as a theme of instruction—(1) that the past should be used, as needed, to elucidate the present, without regard to boundaries of subjects, such as geography, literature, economics, history, etc.; (2) that there should be systematic study of history, but that the selection of subjects or events to be studied should be determined solely by present interests; (3) that there should be a study of history for its own sake, because it represents what the past was and how the present came to be. The work of the committee was based on the last conception. Professor Johnson then gave concrete illustrations of methods of teaching pupils in the grades. The central idea was that of so presenting material as to lead pupils to do constructive thinking; to use the historical method in implanting the idea of change, in evaluating evidence, and in forming conclusions. The speaker approved the proposal of a course in world history in the high schools.[3]

The secretary of the committee, Mr. Daniel C. Knowlton, outlined the proposed course in modern history for grade X, consisting of a preliminary course of one semester in ancient and medieval history and a semester in modern history. Main topics and subtopics were enumerated, chosen for the purpose of showing the progress toward democracy in Europe, for grade X, to be followed by a course in American history with a similar purpose, for grade XI, and one in problems resulting from the growth of democracy, for grade XII. Miss Harriet Tuell, president of the New England History Teachers' Association, criticized the committee's plan as inadequate, as running beyond the capacity of the average high-school pupil, and as laying undue emphasis on one phase of European development—the growth of democracy.

In view of the transfer of the chairman of this committee, Professor Schafer, from Oregon to a new occupation in Wisconsin, and of other changes of occupation by other members, the committee asked to be discharged and to have its work reviewed and concluded by a fresh committee. The council acceded to this request and appointed a new committee to be called the committee on history teaching in schools, of which the chairman is Professor Johnson.

[3] Mr. Johnson's address, together with a preliminary report by Mr. Schafer, will be found in the Historical Outlook for March, 1921, XII, 87–97.

Another session having a special character was that devoted to the history of science. Its chairman, Dr. Robert S. Woodward, the retiring president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, welcomed the attitude of the American Historical Association toward the history of science, emphasized the need of breaking down the artificial barriers which separate one department of learning or science from another, and recalled plans of earlier years for a general history of the inductive sciences. Of the three papers read, the first was one by Dr. Fielding H. Garrison, librarian of the Surgeon General's Office, on "Recent realignments in the history of medieval medicine and science." While the most important medical texts of classical antiquity and the Middle Ages were issued in type by the renaissance printers, much of the scientific and medical literature of those times remained in manuscript, and it was not till quite recent years that either the early printed books or the thousands of medical and other scientific manuscripts have been subjected to careful examination. The result has been to show that the medieval physicians were weak in anatomy and in physiology; that internal medicine was with them a matter of tradition, both as to theory and as to practice; but that in surgery and in hygiene their accomplishment was considerable. Other branches of science developed in the Middle Ages chiefly through the pursuit of practical inventions.

The second of these papers in the history of science was one on "Developments in electromagnetism during the last hundred years," by Prof. Arthur E. Kennelly, of Harvard.[4] The occasion of this survey was the hundredth anniversary of Oersted's discovery of the connection between electricity and magnetism—of the deflecting of the magnetic needle by an electric current. The development of the subject was traced, from Ampère's epochmaking paper of the same year, 1820, through his subsequent researches, through Faraday's discovery of electromagnetic induction, through the applications to telegraphy, ocean cables, and the telephone, through Clerk Maxwell's researches into the relations between electricity and light, the subsequent investigation of radioelectric waves, and the study of the electron theory of matter. This session concluded with a paper by Prof. James H. Robinson, of the New School of Social Research, in New York, on "Free thought, yesterday and to-day." Treating his subject with characteristic wit and pungency of statement, from the point of view of the student of intellectual history, he compared especially the modes of thought of the eighteenth century deists and other philosophers with our own, and set forth the gains to modern thinking derived from the scientific advance of the last century.

[4] Printed in a modified form in the Boston Transcript of Jan. 26, 1921.

Proceeding now to the main body of substantive papers, or papers read as contributions to history, it must be said that on the whole they seemed to be of less importance or excellence than the average of what has been brought forward on such occasions in the past, yet some were of exceptionally high quality. The most convenient plan for giving some notion of what the papers not already mentioned contained is perhaps to deal with them in the chronological order of their subjects, beginning with ancient history. In the session devoted to that field, the first paper was read by Dr. Donald McFayden, of the University of Nebraska, on the "Growth of autocracy in the Roman Empire." Its main features were an argument that the powers granted to the princeps in 23 B. C. did not include a legal majus imperium over the senatorial provinces, and, derived from this, a theory of the evolution of the princeps' relation to the administration of justice. Contrary to the accepted view, he held that under the Augustan Constitution the princeps possessed no jurisdiction except over the imperial provinces, that the activities of his judicial court and of that held by the praefectus urbi as his deputy were technically unconstitutional, and that the appellate jurisdiction of the princeps was simply an outgrowth of the tendency to refer all difficult problems to his arbitrament—to make him the chief jurisconsult of the empire. Hadrian's action in organizing a council of eminent jurisconsults to assist him in rendering his decisions fixed him in that position. The extra-legal origin of the jurisdiction exercised by the princeps and his deputies was held to explain the relatively informal character of their procedure, while the alliances between the empire and the professional lawyers impregnated the later Roman law with the spirit of absolutism.

Next followed an important paper on the "Origin of the Russian state on the Dnieper," by Prof. Mikhail Rostovtsev, formerly of the Petrograd Academy of Sciences, now of the University of Wisconsin. In the ninth century, when the Russian annals begin to give a systematic record, we find Russia to have already a civilization of its own and a well-defined political, social, and economic structure, having for its basis a group of commercial city-states, defended and in part ruled by alien princes invited from without, one of whom, in that century, succeeded in uniting the whole group of cities under one dynasty and into one State, with its capital at Kiev. The problem of the paper was to account for this form of organization, so strikingly different from the agricultural and feudal form prevalent at that epoch in western Europe. It was to be solved only by taking into consideration that earlier history of south Russia of which a portion was treated by Professor Rostovtsev in an article printed in our last number.[5] The civilization depicted in that article as

[5] Pp. 203–224, above.

prevailing under the joint influence of the Greek colonial cities and the Iranian-Scythian empire was not destroyed when the Sarmatian power replaced the Scythian, nor when Celtic and after them Germanic invaders came. They took over, as it was their interest to do, the commercial relations which they found; and when the Germans passed on into the Roman Empire and the west, the Slavs, in the main, simply took their place, founded a State of the same type, took over their towns, their trade relations, and their civilization—not a Germanic, nor thereafter a Slavonic, civilization, but the ancient Graeco-Iranian civilization of the Scythians and Sarmatians, with slight modifications. The Slavonic is but one of the epochs in the evolution of Russia, but with this difference, that the Slavs made Russia their final aim and home.

A paper on "The problem of control in medieval industry,"[6] by Dr. Austin P. Evans, of Columbia University, addressed itself to questions made timely by the recent tendency to extol medieval economic organization as worthy of imitation in our time. The author showed how medieval theories respecting property and value left the Government, of State or city, free to control the production and sale of goods. As to the warmly debated question, whether guilds freely controlled industry, whether guilds were everywhere under the control of civil authorities of State or town, or whether guilds had a larger measure of autonomy while the civil authorities maintained residuary power, Mr. Evans held that most commonly the guilds were under the ulterior control of the State, but he deprecated sweeping generalizations in a field marked by so much variety, and also all tendency to idealize the economic organization prevalent in the Middle Ages.

The only other paper in medieval history was one by Prof. Louis J. Paetow, of the University of California, on "Latin as an international language in the Middle Ages." Modern civilization, he pointed out, rests on the achievements of Latin Christendom in that period, yet, though the Latin language was the chief engine of civilization throughout those ages, so little effort has been applied to the scholarly study of medieval Latin that Du Cange's Glossarium, published in 1678 and augmented largely in the eighteenth century, is still referred to as its standard dictionary. Made international by the Western Church, that speech remained the common medium of communication and literature throughout western Europe, its chief bond of union, until the Italian humanists, while enthusiastically awakening classical Latin to new life, fatally checked the development of the current Latin as a living and international language. Recent efforts to restore Latin to that position were described.

[6] Printed in the Political Science Quarterly, Vol. XXXVI, No. 4, December, 1921.

The paper of Prof. George M. Dutcher, of Wesleyan University, on "The enlightened despotism," opened with a brief analysis in which the enlightened despotism was characterized as based upon the authority of reason and not upon humanitarianism. Next the origin of the movement in Prussia, rather than in the more progressive nations, England and France, was explained. Conditions in the German lands at the close of the Thirty Years' War were sketched with special reference to the situation of the Hohenzollern possessions, and the constructive policy and work of the Great Elector were outlined as the earliest manifestation of the enlightened despotism, whose foremost exponent was that prince's great-grandson, Frederick the Great. Special emphasis was laid upon Frederick's achievement in internal administration during the 10 years' truce beginning in 1745, and its imitation by Maria Theresa, in the rival campaigns of preparedness preceding the Seven Years' War. The priority of these reforming activities in administration to the appearance of the famous writings on government by the French philosophical thinkers was brought out as evidence that the enlightened despotism developed as a practical achievement, not as a response to the stimulus of political theorists. In short, it was an effort at administrative efficiency designed for the aggrandizement of the State, which was conceived of as an entity above rulers as well as above subjects and as founded on the authority of reason rather than on divine right.

Later periods of European history were traversed in a summary survey of "The break-up of the Hapsburg Empire," by Prof. Archibald C. Coolidge, of Harvard University, and in a paper on "Sinn Fein," by Prof. Edward R. Turner, of the University of Michigan. Dr. Ralph H. Lutz, of Stanford University, narrated the history of "The Spartacist uprising in Germany," of which he had been an eyewitness in Berlin. Miss Ruth Putnam, in a paper entitled "The aspirations of one small State," described the evolution of the grand-duchy of Luxemburg from the time when it first obtained the opportunity of self-determination, after the armistice of November, 1918, to recent days. This paper, too, was based in large part on the data of an eyewitness. Problems of labor, finance, railroads, and economic affiliation with the neighoring countries were described, and some account given of the course and achievements of parties under a new constitution providing for woman suffrage and proportional representation.

In a paper on "The establishment of a new Poland," Col. Lucius H. Holt, of the United States Military Academy, traced the establishment of a new government, and political events in Poland from the outbreak of the war in 1914 to the present date. The paper emphasized the work of the supreme national committee during the years

from 1914 to 1916. It traced briefly the influences which led the Central Powers to recognize Poland in the autumn of 1915, and the subsequent incidents which revealed the duplicity of Germany and turned the Poles against that country. It summarized the points in the allied recognition of Poland in 1918. It outlined the clash of conflicting political forces in Poland during the armistice period and the result, spoke of the elections of January, 1919, and closed with a statement of the progress made by the Polish Assembly upon the draft of a constitution.

The last of the papers which we may describe as bearing on the history of the Old World was that of Dr. Stephen P. Duggan, director of the Institute of International Education, on "Syria, Palestine, and Mandates."[7] When the Great War broke out the Allies found strong support among the Syrian patriots and leaders who, under the rule of the Young Turks, or exiled by them, had been contending for an autonomous or independent Syria administered by Arabs with Arabic as official language. Unfortunately, the agreement of October 25, 1915, made between the Sherif of the Hejaz and the British High Commission at Cairo, conflicted with the provisions of the Sykes-Picot treaty between France and Great Britain as to the disposition of the Arab lands of the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, that treaty was considered by the Arabs to be superseded by the Anglo-French declaration of November 8, 1918. When, therefore, after the occupation of the territory by General Allenby, mandates were given by the Supreme Council to Great Britain for Palestine and to France for Syria, the Arab nationalists considered that they had been deceived, opposed the erection of a Zionist commonwealth in Palestine, and entered on a course of conflict with the British in Palestine and of warfare with the French elsewhere in Syria.

At the end of this last session, Dr. Victor Andrés Belaunde, of the University of San Marcos of Lima, Peru, read a brief paper on "The communistic system of the Incas," and the comparison between its features and those of Russian communism under Lenin and Trotzky.

Passing now to the papers in American history, it is to be noted that, appropriately to the date, one session was devoted to commemorating the tercentenary of the arrival of the Pilgrim Fathers. In this session three papers were read, of which the first by Prof. Clive Day, of Yale University, dealt with "Capitalistic and socialistic tendencies in the Puritan colonies." Its special object was to consider a view recently advanced by the late Prof. Max Weber, of Heidelberg, that in the development of the modern capitalist and of a capitalistic society, as set forth in Sombart's familiar analysis, an essential source

[7] Printed in the Journal of International Relations, April, 1921, under the title, "The Syrian Question."

of the capitalist spirit is to be found in the religious beliefs and ethical principles of the Puritans. Confining himself to the Puritans of New England, the speaker set forth the results of a careful examination of their sermons and laws as expressions of their ethical ideals. He did not find that encouragements to industry and thrift bulked large in their sermons and concluded that whatever urgency was manifest toward the accumulation of capital, greatly needed in the colonies, was social rather than individual and capitalistic in its motives.

Mr. Lincoln N. Kinnicutt, of Worcester, followed with a paper entitled, "The settlement of Plymouth contemplated before 1620." Its thesis was that Sir Ferdinando Gorges desired a settlement at Plymouth Harbor and did what he could to guide the Pilgrims thither, supplying them with information and endeavoring to arrange that Captain Dermer and Tisquantum should be at hand to point their way, possibly also making private arrangements with Captain Jones of the *Mayflower*.

Thirdly, Prof. David S. Muzzey, of Columbia University, in a paper on "The heritage of the Puritans," after acknowledging the defects characteristic of Puritanism but urging that all estimates of these should be based on comparisons with contemporaneous phenomena rather than with those of the present time, set forth in admirable style three principal portions of our inheritance from the Puritans and Pilgrims—the results of their political philosophy, with its insistence on covenant as the basis of civil relations; the influence of the New England town, primordial cell of local self-government; and the emphasis which the Puritans permanently placed upon unremitting education for responsibility.

The paper on "The slave trade into South Carolina before the Revolution," by Miss Elizabeth Donnan, of Wellesley College, a product of researches conducted on behalf of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, derived its information for the first third of the eighteenth century from offical papers, dealing with those aspects of the trade in which British officials and British merchants concerned themselves, such as the import taxes imposed by the colony, payment of debts to British merchants, and monopoly by the Royal Co. From 1732 we have the files of the South Carolina Gazette and from 1748 the business letters of Henry Laurens. From these two sources much can be learned concerning the actual process of buying and selling the black cargoes, which were handled by importing merchants, prominent in Charleston society, who were giving to their British principals copious information concerning weather, crops, prices, and other factors which influenced the market. The paper described in detail such matters as the terms of contract between principal and factor and between factor

and purchasing planter, the methods of the auction sales, the range of territory covered, and the risks and difficulties which the factor encountered.

The paper which was read by Prof. Fiske Kimball, of the University of Virginia, on "Architecture in the history of the Colonies and of the Republic," in which he traversed several current notions as to the influence of pioneer conditions on American colonial building, and emphasized the American elements in the development of classical architecture in the early years of the Republic, appears in the October (1921) issue of the Review.

The paper entitled "John Wesley, Tory," by Prof. William W. Sweet, of De Pauw University, treated of the activities and influence of Wesley during the American Revolution. In the 10 years beginning with 1768 Wesley published 10 political pamphlets. The first 3 were caused by the excitement concerning the case of John Wilkes, and took the side of King and Government; the fourth was devoted to the slave trade, of which Wesley was one of the earliest opponents. The remaining 6 have to do with the American Revolution, the first and most important of them being "A calm address to our American Colonies" (1775). In all of them Wesley invariably supports the King and Government. The reasons for his course are complex—he was born and bred a High-Churchman and a Tory; he believed in the divine right of kings, for that theory seemed to him the most religious; he was a firm supporter of law and order; he hated rebellion; the King had been kindly disposed toward the Methodists; the King's private life and his court were free from scandal; Lord Dartmouth was a leader in the Evangelical movement. Wesley's position on the American war led to some suspicion and even persecution of American Methodists as Tories, but at the close of the war he was wise enough to recognize the result as providential and set about to organize the American Methodists into an independent church.

In the paper by Prof. Homer C. Hockett, of the Ohio State University, on "The American background of federalism," the endeavor was to show the part played by American influences in the development of the two chief modern federations, the American Union and the British Empire. He held that the immediate background of our own federalism lay rather in the relations of the Colonies to one another than in the previous practices of the British Empire; that while the modern British imperial organization, as a league of autonomous commonwealths, was foreshadowed by the American position in the controversy preceding the Revolution, British policy was not changed by the American contention; but that the essential change in that policy resulted rather from the undermining of mercantilism, and thus of the

old colonial system, by Adam Smith's political economy, and from the aggressive demands of the Canadians for responsible government.

Of the papers on American history in the early part of the nineteenth century, that of Prof. Louis M. Sears, of Purdue University, on "Philadelphia and the embargo of 1808,"[8] adverted first to the ambiguous position of that city in respect to economic status at that time. As a commercial city, Philadelphia was subject to the distress entailed by the embargo upon all sections of the commercial population. But Philadelphia, in common with Baltimore and other ports of the Middle States, possessed an incitement to manufactures in her proximity to the new trans-Alleghany settlements. She seized her opportunity, actually developed a considerable manufacturing industry, and won prosperity for a greater number of her citizens than the embargo had impoverished. The material expression of this prosperity was a building boom involving the construction of over a thousand houses. The political expression was a continued confidence in the Democratic party and in the wisdom and goodness of Thomas Jefferson, Philadelphia being, according to one's point of view, either the shining exception to the folly of the Jeffersonian system, or else the shining example of its wisdom.

In the joint session held with the Agricultural History Society, Prof. Percy W. Bidwell, of Yale University, read a paper, which we shall later have the privilege of presenting in full to our readers, on "The agricultural revolution in New England, 1815–1860," showing how the development of New England manufactures and the creation of factory villages began a transition from farming for a living to farming for profit, how the building of railroads, just as this transition to commercial agriculture was well under way, subjected the New England farmer to disastrous competition from the westward, and how he carried out the readjustment of his economic system which was thus forced upon him.

In the same joint session, Mr. Herbert A. Kellar, of the McCormick Library, Chicago, read a paper on "The influence of the agricultural fair upon American society, 1830–1851," and Mr. Rudolf A. Clemen, of Northwestern University, one on "The economic bases of the American system of large-scale meat packing." Sketching the earlier history of the American trade in livestock and meat and that of the period when Cincinnati was the center and pork the staple, Mr. Clemen devoted his attention chiefly to the period since the establishment of the Chicago stockyards in 1865, and to the economic results of the four chief factors, all introduced about 1870–1875, which gave the meat industry the form it has since borne—the system of ranges and ranches in the far West, the extention of routes of transportation to

[8] An outline of this paper appears in the Quarterly Journal of Economics for February, 1921, pp. 354-359.

the sources of supply, the development of refrigeration and of the refrigerator car, and the rise of the great organizers of distribution.

There was but one paper relating to the period of the Civil War, that of Prof. Charles W. Ramsdell, of the University of Texas, on "The control of manufacturing by the Confederate government." He showed that while the strong individualism of the South prevented the Confederacy from regulating manufactures as a feature of its civil policy, a rigorous control was established over the production of cloth and leather through military agencies, particularly the quartermaster's bureau. By means of the conscription and impressment laws, the supplies of labor, wool, hides, and railway transportation came under the control of the War Department, which was able to force the factories and tanneries to contract almost exclusively with the government when they preferred the higher profits of the public market. The State government of North Carolina, however, interposed successfully to prevent Confederate control of manufactures in that State and to preserve their products for the exclusive use of North Carolina troops.

Only two papers bore on the history of the United States between 1865 and 1900, none on our history in the twentieth century. Both of these two bore on aspects of that period which derive their significance from the economic problems which emerged with the growth of capitalism after the Civil War and which are still unsolved. The first was a paper by Prof. John D. Hicks, of Hamline University, Minnesota, on "The political career of Ignatius Donnelly," who figured in the politics of Minnesota and of the Nation, throughout the period named, as the champion, ardent but unpractical, of every movement that gave promise of bettering the lot of the ordinary man and securing his rights against the claims of property. Indifferent to party—by turns Anti-Monopolist, Greenbacker, Democrat, Republican, Farmers' Alliance man, Populist, Middle-of-the-Roader—he sought his cherished reforms most commonly through third-party movements. His final rejection of opportunist tactics was exhibited when the main body of Populists adopted the policy of fusion with the Democratic Party in 1896.

In a paper on "Agrarian discontent in the South during the eighties and nineties of the last century," Prof. B. B. Kendrick, of Columbia University, dwelt on only two of the causes of that discontent. The primary cause, social, lay in the fact that the southern farmer occupied in 1890, in the economical, the political, and especially the social life of the country, a position much lower than he had in 1860. The principal economic cause of his unrest lay in the lien-law system—an evil peculiar to the southern farmer—under which the farmer was almost a serf to the city merchant to whom he happened to be indebted.

Other elements in the southern situation were not peculiar to that section, but were such as, in the case of the West, have been adequately treated in the books of Buck, Haines, Garland, White, and others; but the history of the southern farmer in that period still awaits systematic investigation.

Papers on "Pan American political and diplomatic relations"—the general theme of one of the sessions held jointly by the Historical and the Political Science Associations, fall last to be described. That of Prof. Herman G. James, of the University of Texas, on "Recent constitutional changes in Latin America," is printed in full elsewhere.[9] That of Prof. Julius Klein, of Harvard, entitled "The Monroe doctrine as a regional understanding," was, so far as historical content is concerned, devoted to an interesting exposition of the ways and extent in which the period of the Great War has brought to the South American Republics appreciation of their own capacity for self-development, promoted international cooperation within South America in economic and social matters, enhanced the application of South American capital to industrial and commercial enterprises, and furthered economic independence of Europe while multiplying contacts with North America. The probable bearing of all this on the development of the Monroe doctrine was described.[10]

Prof. Manoel de Oliveira Lima, the eminent Brazilian scholar who has lately become a member of the Catholic University of America, concluded this series with a paper on "Pan Americanism and the League of Nations," in which, after reviewing some earlier attempts at forming leagues which had originated in South America, he advocated, as the most desirable feature of any league of nations, a supreme court to deal with differences, interpretations, and controversies, and dwelt on the "Pan American conscience," the consciousness of the need of union in the New World, and its common respect for public law, as secure foundations for any closer relations between its members.

It remains to narrate the transactions of the annual business meeting. The delay in the printing of our January number made it possible to insert in that number, on pages 411 and 412, some account of these transactions, but a fuller narrative is, according to custom, expected in this place, and may be given in spite of some repetition necessarily involved.

The secretary's report showed a membership of 2,524, a gain of 79 since the preceding year; the gain is to be attributed to the activity of the committee on membership. The treasurer's report showed

[9] "Constitutional tendencies in Latin America," Current History, February, 1921.

[10] This paper and that of Dr. Oliveira Lima, next mentioned, appeared in the May, 1921, number of the Hispanic-American Historical Review.

receipts of $10,483, expenditures of $9,786; but the cost of printing the American Historical Review has increased to so extraordinary a degree, especially in the latter months of the year, that drastic measures will be necessary in order to avoid a deficit for the year 1921. These costs of manufacture have been steadily rising since the year before the Great War. The publishers' estimates seem to show that in 1921 they will surpass those of the year last mentioned by more than 80 per cent. Instead of paying to the Macmillan Co. 50 cents per copy for copies supplied to members of the association as required by the present contract, it becomes necessary to pay hereafter 70 cents, or per annum $2.80, nearly the total sum paid to the association by each member as his annual dues. Therefore the association voted to submit to the next annual meeting an amendment to the constitution increasing the annual dues from $3 to $5 (and the life-membership fee from $50 to $100), and in the meantime to authorize the treasurer, when sending out the bills in September, to invite voluntary contributions of from $2 to $5 additional to the dues. The text of the proposed amendment to the constitution is given in the appendix to this article. Provision was also made for a committee on increase of the endowment, which now stands at $31,639.

The special committee on policy, appointed three years ago, submitted an elaborate report. Many of its recommendations require additional funds for their execution. Such as could be carried into effect under existing conditions were adopted. Thus, in order to secure permanence and continuity of policy of the committee on program, it was voted that three members of that committee should serve for terms of three years so arranged that one member should retire each year, while the other members were to serve for terms of one year and be selected with reference to locality. Other recommendations of the committee on policy, adopted by the Association, provided for continuance or revival of the public archives commission, the committee on bibliography, and the committee on the documentary historical publications of the United States Government; for the discharge, at its own request, as mentioned on a previous page of the present committee on history and education for citizenship in the schools and the substitution of a new committee on history teaching in schools; and for the establishment of a standing committee on military history, whose chief function should be to cooperate with the Historical Branch of the General Staff of the United States Army, and other governmental agencies, national and State, engaged in preparing historical works relative to the recent war. As a means of carrying out the desires which have at times been expressed for a special journal of European history, or an organ for the publication of brief monographs in that field, the committee on policy recom-

mended the establishment, when means are at hand, of a series of historical studies; the details were referred to a committee.

The budget proposed by the council is printed on a later page, in connection with an outline of the treasurer's report.

Under the terms of the will of the late George Louis Beer a prize was established, to be known as the George Louis Beer prize, for the "best work upon any phase of European international history since the year 1895"; a committee was appointed to shape rules for its award. The prize offered in military history, to which the council had appropriately given the name of the Robert M. Johnston prize, was awarded to Mr. Thomas R. Hay, for an essay on Hood's Tennessee campaign. It was announced that the committee on the Justin Winsor prize had been unable to agree, and the three essays most regarded were referred to a new committee on that prize appointed for the biennium 1921–22.

A special committee was appointed by the council at the instance of the secretary, to consider the general subject of historical writing (as distinguished from historical research) in the United States and to report as to what means, if any, may be adopted to stimulate the better writing of history. The committee appointed consists of Mr. Jusserand, Dr. Charles W. Colby, and Prof. W. C. Abbott; its report on this exceedingly important subject will be awaited with much interest.

A committee of which Prof. George M. Dutcher is chairman had been appointed at the preceding annual meeting to prepare a manual of historical literature to replace the well-known work by the late Dr. Charles K. Adams. One of the breakfast conferences held during the sessions was organized in order that those who are to take part in the preparation of this manual might hear a report of progress and discuss various questions of policy. The committee's plan involves some further chapters additional to those in Doctor Adams's book, the inclusion of at least half as many more titles, but with somewhat briefer reviews, in order to keep the size of the volume not much larger, and the assignment of each of the proposed 29 chapters to an expert in its field, as chapter editor, with assistance from other specialists. It is anticipated that the new work, which was originally suggested by the American Library Association, will find its largest usefulness in public libraries and high schools, but that it will not be without value for teachers and students in colleges and universities. Most of the titles will be of works which have appeared since the publication of Doctor Adams's book, and there will be a somewhat larger proportion of books in English treated.

It was voted, on a hospitable invitation from St. Louis, that the next annual meeting should be held in that city. The dates will probably be December 28, 29, and 30.

The annual elections followed precisely the list presented by the committee on nominations. His excellency the French ambassador, Mr. Jusserand, was chosen president for the ensuing year, Prof. Charles H. Haskins first vice president, Prof. Edward P. Cheyney second vice president. Prof. John S. Bassett and Mr. Charles Moore were reelected secretary and treasurer, respectively. The election to the executive council also followed precisely the committee's list, except that Professor Becker withdrew his name, preferring to continue as a member of the board of editors of the Review, whereupon the committee substituted the name of Professor Sioussat. The councilors elected were: Miss Ruth Putnam, Profs. Arthur L. Cross, Sidney B. Fay, Carl R. Fish, Carlton J. H. Hayes, Frederic L. Paxson, James T. Shotwell, and St. George L. Sioussat. The council elected Prof. Guy S. Ford a member of the board of editors of the Review in the place of Prof. J. H. Robinson, whose term had expired, and Prof. Archibald C. Coolidge in the place of Professor Cheyney, who resigned after being elected a vice president. For the committee on nominations, to be presented next autumn, the association chose Profs. Henry E. Bourne, William E. Dodd, Eloise Ellery, Frank H. Hodder, and William E. Lingelbach; the committee has since chosen Professor Hodder as chairman. A full list of the committee assignments for 1921 follows this article.

In view of the small number of the ballots which had been received in the autumnal "primary," and by which the committee on nominations had been guided, the outgoing chairman of that committee, Mr. Victor H. Paltsits, proposed for consideration next year an amendment of by-law No. II which would abolish the provision for this formal balloting and would leave it to the committee to nominate, with only such indications from other members as letters received from them, or their conversations, might supply. Meantime it was voted that the preliminary ballot should be omitted in 1921. It may, however, properly be pointed out that it would be possible to maintain the present machinery of balloting and nominating committee, yet to instruct the committee, or leave it to understand, that, while deriving whatever instruction it can from the results of the ballot, it is not bound to follow rigidly, without discretion, its numerical results.

PROGRAM OF THE THIRTY-FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., DECEMBER 27–30, 1920

Monday, December 27

9.30 a.m.: MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL. 1140 Woodward Building, Fifteenth and H Streets.

8.15 p.m.: MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY. Washington Hotel. Chairman, Edward A. Ross, University of Wisconsin. "Eudemics; a science of national welfare," James Q. Dealey, Brown University, president of the American Sociological Society. "A theory of social interest," Roscoe Pound, Harvard University.

Tuesday, December 28

10 a.m.: MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY. Large ball room, north end. Chairman, William E. Lingelbach, University of Pennsylvania. "The enlightened despotism," George M. Dutcher, Wesleyan University. "Sinn Fein," Edward R. Turner, University of Michigan. "The aspirations of one small nation," Ruth Putnam, Washington, D. C. "The establishment of a new Poland," Col. Lucius H. Holt, United States Military Academy.

10 a.m.: ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY. Large ball room, south end. Chairman, George L. Burr, Cornell University. "The growth of autocracy in the Roman Empire," Donald MacFayden, University of Nebraska. "The origin of the Russian state on the Dnieper," M. I. Rostovtzeff, University of Wisconsin. "The problem of control in medieval industry," Austin P. Evans, Columbia University. "Latin as an international language in the Middle Ages," Louis J. Paetow, University of California.

10 a. m.: JOINT MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF HISTORICAL SOCIETIES AND THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE WAR HISTORY ORGANIZATIONS. Room 1003. Chairman, James Sullivan, historian of the State of New York. "Progress in the collection of war records by State war history organizations," Karl Singewald, historical division, Maryland Council of Defense. "Suggestions and plans for State and local publications of war history," Albert E. McKinley, University of Pennsylvania. "Coördination of historical societies within the State," Joseph Schafer, State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Discussion: Worthington C. Ford, Massachusetts Historical Society; Harlow Lindley, Earlham College; Edmond S. Meany, University of Washington.

12.30 p. m.: Luncheon conference: Opportunities for historical research in Washington. Library of Congress. Chairman, J. Franklin Jameson, director of the Department of Historical Research, Carnegie Institution of Washington. Discussion: Gaillard Hunt, Department of State; Charles Moore, Library of Congress; Theodore Belote, curator of American history in the National Museum; William A. Dunning, Columbia University; Frederick J. Turner, Harvard University; W. F. Willoughby, Institute for Government Research.

3.30 p. m.: Business meeting of the National Association of State War History Organizations. Room 1003.

4 p. m. General Session Commemorating the Pilgrim Tercentenary. Large ball room. Chairman, Edward Channing, Harvard University. "Economic precept and practice of the Puritans," Clive Day, Yale University. "The Settlement at Plymouth contemplated before 1620," Lincoln N. Kinnicutt, Massachusetts Historical Society. "The heritage of the Puritans," David Saville Muzzey, Columbia University.

6.15 p.m.: Subscription Dinner of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. New Ebbitt Hotel. Open to members of the other associations and to others interested in American history. Chairman, Chauncey S. Boucher. Address by Frederick J. Turner, Harvard University.

8.15 p.m.: Presidential Addresses. Large ball room. Joint session with the American Political Science Association. Chairman, William A. Dunning, Columbia University. "An historical retrospect," Edward Channing, president of the American Historical Association. "Secret diplomacy: How far can it be eliminated?" Paul S. Reinsch, president of the American Political Science Association.

9.30 p. m.: Smoker for members of all the associations. Cosmos Club.

9.30 p. m.: Reception by the National Club House Committee of the Collegiate Alumnæ Association to all the members of the associations, at the National Club House, 1607 H Street.

Wednesday, December 29

8.15 a. m.: Breakfast conference: The proposed manual of historical literature. New Ebbitt Hotel. Gold room. Chairman, George M. Dutcher, Wesleyan University.

10 a. m.: Conference on the Report of the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship in the Schools. Large ball room. Chairman, Joseph Schafer, State Historical Society of Wisconsin. "Local and American history in grades II–VI; world history in the high school," Henry Johnson, Teachers' College, Columbia University. "Modern European history in grade X," Daniel C. Knowlton, secretary of the committee. Discussion: Harriet Tuell, president of the New England History Teachers' Association. "Topical study of American history for the national period in grade XI," Joseph Schafer. Discussion: Albert E. McKinley, University of Pennsylvania. "Civics in schools, with special reference to grades IX and XII," Arthur W. Dunn, director of Junior Red Cross.

10 a. m.: American History. Joint session with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. Large ball room. Chairman, Chauncey S. Boucher, University of Texas, president of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. "The American background of Federalism," Homer C. Hockett, Ohio State University. "The political career of Ignatius Donnelly," John D. Hicks, Hamline University. "John Wesley, Tory," William W. Sweet, De Pauw University. "Manufacturing activities of the Confederate Government," Charles W. Ramsdell, University of Texas.

10 a. m.: Agricultural History. Joint session with the Agricultural History Society. Room 1003. Chairman, Rodney H. True, president of the Agricultural History Society. "The agricultural revolution in New England, 1810–1860," Percy W. Bidwell, Yale University. "The influence of the agricultural fair upon American society, 1830–1851," Herbert A. Kellar, McCormick Library, Chicago. "The internal grain trade of the United States, 1860–1890," Louis B. Schmidt, Iowa State College.

12.30 p. m.: Luncheon conference on economic history. New Ebbitt Hotel. Gold room. Chairman, Clive Day, Yale University. "The recognition of economic history as a distinct subject," the chairman. "The field for courses in economic history," Abbott Payson Usher, Cornell University. "The relation of courses in economic history to courses in history and economics," Carlton J. H. Hayes, Columbia University. "Fields of research in economic history—Agriculture," Louis B. Schmidt, Iowa State College; "Labor," Frank T. Carlton, De Pauw University.

3 p. m.: ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING. Small ball room, tenth floor. Reports of officers and committees, election of officers, announcement of committee appointments, miscellaneous business.

7 p. m.: SUBSCRIPTION DINNER. Large ball room. For members of all the associations and their friends. Chairman, J. Franklin Jameson, director of the Department of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. Speakers, the French Ambassador; the Secretary of War: Miss Mabel Boardman, Commissioner of the District of Columbia; Hon. Paul S. Reinsch, late minister to China; President Frank J. Goodnow of Johns Hopkins University; Dr. James J. Walsh of Cathedral College, New York; and Prof. Edward A. Ross of the University of Wisconsin.

Thursday, December 30

10 a. m.: AMERICAN HISTORY. Large ball room, south end. Chairman Marshall S. Brown, New York University. "The slave trade into South Carolina," Elizabeth Donnan, Wellesley College. "Architecture in the history of the Colonies and of the Republic," Fiske Kimball, University of Virginia. "Philadelphia and the embargo of 1808," Louis M. Sears, Purdue University. "Agrarian discontent in the South in the eighties and nineties," Benjamin B. Kendrick, Columbia University.

10 a. m: HISTORY OF SCIENCE. Large ball room, north end. Chairman, Robert S. Woodward, president of the Carnegie Institute of Washington. "Recent realignments in the medieval medicine and science," Dr. Fielding H. Garrison, librarian, Surgeon General's Office. "Developments in electro-magnetism during the past hunderd years," Arthur E. Kennelly, Harvard University. "Free thought, yesterday and to-day," James Harvey Robinson, New School for Social Research. "Science in Virginia," Lyon G. Tyler, president emeritus of the College of William and Mary.

12.30 p. m.: Luncheon conference on the history of the Far East. New Ebbitt. Gold room. Chairman, Hon. Paul S. Reinsch, Washington.

12.30 p. m.: Luncheon conference on Latin America. New Ebbitt. Gold room. Chairman, William R. Shepherd, Columbia University.

3 p. m.: PAN AMERICAN POLITICAL AND DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS. Joint session with the American Political Science Association. Pan American Building. Chairman, Leo S. Rowe, director of the Pan American Union. "Recent constitutional changes in Latin America," Herman G. James, University of Texas. "The Monroe doctrine as a regional understanding," Julius Klein, Harvard University. "Pan Americanism and the League of Nations," Manoel de Oliveira Lima, Catholic University of America.

4.30 p. m.: Reception to the members of the associations by His Excellency the French Ambassador and Madame Jusserand at the French Embassy, 2460 Sixteenth Street.

8.15 p. m.: RECENT EUROPEAN HISTORY AND POLITICS. Joint session with the American Political Science Association. Large ball room. "The Spartacan uprising in Germany," Ralph H. Lutz, Leland Stanford Junior University. "The break-up of the Hapsburg Empire," Archibald Cary Coolidge, Harvard University. "Syria, Palestine, and mandates, Stephen P. Duggan," Institute of International Education, New York.

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING HELD IN THE SMALL BALL ROOM OF THE NEW WILLARD HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., ON DECEMBER 29, 1920

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p. m., President Edward Channing presiding.

The secretary of the association presented his annual report (printed in full in the appendix to these minutes). It was voted that the secretary's report be accepted and placed on file.

The treasurer of the association presented his annual report and expenditures (printed in full in the appendix).

The president appointed Mr. Herman V. Ames and Mr. James M. Callahan a committee to audit the treasurer's report. This committee reported that they had examined the treasurer's report and the audit thereof by the American Audit Co. and had found them to be correct.

It was voted that the report of the treasurer be accepted and placed on file.

The treasurer presented the budget as voted by the executive council for the ensuing years, which was adopted as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1921

Secretary and treasurer	$3,000
Pacific Coast Branch	50
Nominating committee	100
Committee on membership	100
Committee on program	300
Committee on local arrangements	50
Conference of historical societies	25
Committee on publications	700
Council committee on agenda	300
American Historical Review	7,000
Historical manuscripts commission	20
Justin Winsor prize	200
Writings on American history	200
American Council of Learned Societies	150
Committee on bibliography	250
Committee on the writing of history	75
	12,520

ESTIMATED INCOME

Annual dues	7,000
Registration fees	150
Publications	100
Royalties	50
Interest	1,400
Miscellaneous	50
	8,750

Mr. George L. Burr announced that at the annual meeting of 1921 he would move an amendment to the constitution as follows:

That, in article III there be substituted for "$3," "$5"; and for "$50," "$100"; so that the article shall read:

Any person approved by the executive council may become a member by paying $5, and after the first year may continue a member by paying an annual fee of $5. On payment of $100 any person may become a life member, exempt from fees. Persons not residing in the United States may be elected as honorary or corresponding members and be exempt from the payment of fees.

The secretary of the association presented the report of the executive council (printed in full in the appendix to these minutes).

It was voted that the report be accepted and placed on file.

Mr. Charles H. Haskins presented with explanatory comment the report of the special committee on policy which the council had voted to transmit to the associa-

tion with its approval. It was voted that the report be accepted (the report is printed in full in the minutes of the executive council).

It was voted that, in acceptance of the invitations extended by Washington University, by the mayor of St. Louis, and by the Governor of Missouri, the thirty-sixth annual meeting of the association should be held in St. Louis during the last week in December, 1921.

The secretary read by title the reports which the committees of the association had submitted to the executive council. No request having been made from the floor for the presentation in full of any of the reports it was voted that they be accepted and placed on file.

The secretary submitted a list of the members who had died during the year.[1]

Mr. John M. Vincent offered a memorial of the late James Schouler, the twelfth president of the association, which was ordered to be spread upon the records of the association (printed in the appendix to these minutes).

It was voted that a memorial of the late George Louis Beer be prepared and spread upon the records of the association (see appendix to these minutes).

Mr. Victor H. Paltsits, chairman of the committee on nominations, presented as the report of the committee the following nominations for officers, members of the executive council, and members of the committee on nominations for the ensuing year:

President, Jean Jules Jusserand.
First vice president, Charles H. Haskins.
Second vice president, Edward P. Cheyney.
Secretary, John Spencer Bassett.
Treasurer, Charles Moore.
Members of the executive council: James T. Shotwell, Ruth Putnam, Carl Russell Fish, Carl L. Becker, Carlton J. H. Hayes, Sidney B. Fay, Frederic L. Paxson, Arthur L. Cross.
Committee on nominations: Frank H. Hodder, Eloise Ellery, William E. Dodd, Henry E. Bourne, William E. Lingelbach.

Mr. Paltsits announced that Mr. Carl L. Becker, nominated for election to the executive council, had withdrawn his name from nomination and that the nominating committee had not been able to make another nomination in order to fill the vacancy. He therefore offered from the floor the nomination of Mr. St. George L. Sioussat for election to the council in the place of Mr. Carl L. Becker.

No other nominations being made from the floor, it was voted by unanimous consent that the secretary of the association be requested to cast the ballot of the association for the persons nominated by the nominating committee, Mr. St. George L. Sioussat being substituted for Mr. Carl L. Becker in the nominations for the council.

The secretary reported that he had cast the ballot as instructed, and the persons nominated were declared duly elected.

Mr. Channing then vacated the chair, and in the absence of the newly elected president and first vice president, it was taken by Mr. Edward P. Cheyney, the second vice president.

Mr. Paltsits offered the following amendment to by-law II, to be acted upon at the annual meeting of 1921:

The word "nomination," line 1, be changed to "nominating," and the sentence beginning "at such," line 3, and ending "be chosen," line 7, be omittted. Change "one day," line 14, to "two days"; so that by-law II will read as follows:

A nominating committee of five members shall be chosen at each annual business meeting in the manner hereafter provided for the election of officers of the association. It shall publish and mail to each member at least one month prior to the annual business meeting such nominations as it may determine upon for each elective office and for the next nominating committee. It shall prepare for use at the annual business meeting an official ballot containing, as candidates for each office or committee membership to be filled thereat, the names of its nominees and also the names of any other nominees which may be proposed to the chairman of the committee in writ-

[1] See list of deceased members, p. 60.

ing by 20 or more members of the association at least two days before the annual business meeting, but such nominations by petition shall not be presented until after the committee shall have reported its nominations to the association as provided for in the present by-law. The official ballot shall also provide, under each office, a blank space for voting for such further nominees as any member may present from the floor at the time of the election.

On motion of Mr. Paltsits, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the operation of the sentence in by-law II, beginning in the third line with the words "at such convenient time" and ending in the seventh line with the words "then to be chosen,"[2] namely, the operation of a preliminary referendum, be suspended during the year 1921.

The list of persons appointed by the executive council to serve on committees during the year 1921 was read by the secretary (see minutes of the executive council for the list of appointments).

There being no further business the meeting adjourned.

JAMES SCHOULER

The American Historical Association desires to place upon its minutes its tribute to the memory of James Schouler, LL. D., former member and officer of that body. The society long ago gave expression to its esteem by election to the highest offices in its gift, but these honors were but one manifestation of the warm personal relations which were for many years maintained between him and the members of the association.

As a soldier he fought for the unity of his native land; as a lawyer he contributed much to the literature of American jurisprudence; as an historian he devoted a large part of his life to the study of his country from its federal foundation; as a benefactor he provided, both during his lifetime and hereafter, for the continuation of historical studies in a prominent university.

His volumes will stand upon their merits with the general public, while to many students of American history and to the younger members of the profession his sympathetic interest and helpfulness will remain a source of inspiration and of grateful remembrance.

GEORGE LOUIS BEER

In the death of George Louis Beer at the height of his powers historical scholarship has suffered a painful loss, a sad sense of which this executive council desires to have expression in its records. His brief life exhibited the best traits of the gentleman, the scholar, and the citizen. Graduated from college at the age of 20, he received from Prof. H. L. Osgood the impulse that centered his interest on the commercial policy of Great Britain toward her American Colonies. For 20 years he devoted himself with singleness of aim and untiring industry to study of the historical antecedents of this policy, till by 1912 he had embodied in four published volumes a complete history of the British colonial system from 1578 to 1765. By this work Beer took, at the age of 40, high rank as a historian. In thoroughness of research among hitherto unknown or neglected sources, in freshness of interpretation and clarity of presentation, he furnished a model of historiography on its more technical side, and a massive support for the view that the revolt of the American Colonies was the result rather of transient political and economic differences among Britons than of permanent antipathies between Britons and Americans. Firmly convinced

[2] This is the second sentence in by-law II and reads as follows: "At such convenient time prior to the 15th of September as it may determine it shall invite every member to express to it his preference regarding every office to be filled by election at the ensuing annual business meeting and regarding the composition of the new nominating committee then to be chosen."

of the truth of this view, Beer became active in promoting good relations between the two peoples and in strengthening the bonds between Great Britain and her dominions. With the development of the World War, his wide and accurate knowledge, sound judgment, and practical sagacity came very actively into public service. At the Peace Conference he was one of the most trusted of the American experts, and when the League of Nations was organized he was named to an important position on its staff. Death took him before he could assume his duties.

In Beer's personality the dominant note was modesty and self-effacement. No man of his learning and wisdom ever seemed less conscious of them than he. In the affairs of the American Historical Association he evaded prominence, but his loyalty to its purposes was deep and sincere. It is some poor mitigation of our grief over his untimely death to reflect that in the spirit of his writings and in the prize that he has established his influence will abide and grow mightily through generations.

Report of the Secretary

My residence in Washington during a sabbatical half year beginning with February 1, 1920, enabled me to gain much valuable information from Mr. Leland, my predecessor in office. I gladly take this opportunity to acknowledge his helpfulness, and to express my great admiration for the ability with which he has conducted the office, as revealed to me in my examination of the records and frequent consultations with him in regard to matters that have come up for action.

My residence in Washington enabled me to avail myself of the services of the assistant secretary, Miss Washington, whose readiness to help me is gratefully acknowledged. By reason of this help it was possible to carry on the work of my office during this period without extra expense to the association. During the autumn, when I have been in Northampton, the expenses have been reduced to a sum of less than $20 up to December 1. In that sum are included the cost of a brief visit to Branford, Conn., to attend the meeting of the committee on policy.

Membership.—The total number of members December 15, 1920, was 2,524, as compared with 2,445 in 1919 and 2,519 in 1918. This showing probably means that the downward tendency in membership since 1915 has been stopped and progress upward has been resumed. The losses for the current year were 206, against 282 in 1919 and 285 in 1918, and they are nearly the same as in 1914, when they were 205. At no time between 1914 and 1920 have the losses been as low as in 1920. The total gain for the year was 285, more than in any year since 1915, when it was 290. Finally, this is the first year since 1915 when the membership has not shown a net decrease. It is interesting to observe the regional distribution of the net increase of 79. New England gained 6, the North Atlantic division lost 5, the South Atlantic division gained 16, the North Central division gained 30, the South Central division gained 2, the West Central division gained 11, the Pacific Coast States gained 8, and foreign countries gained 11. The largest net gain, therefore, was in the North Central division, where the net gain was 30, and the next largest was in the South Atlantic division, where it was 16. As to the new members during the year, New York led with 33, Ohio came next with 26, and California next with 21.

This favorable report on membership is due chiefly to the present committee on membership, Professor Wertenbaker, chairman. The committee has divided the country into districts, with associate members appointed by the committee. The chairman feels that the organization is not yet perfect, but that it can be improved and made to yield still better results. In order that it may best serve the ends it was created to reach, the committee should have a long term of office, with power to appoint associates as it sees fit.

Gifts to the association.—During the year the association has received a portrait of James Schouler, an ex-president of this association, a bequest in Mr Schouler's will.

The portrait is now in the office of this association in the Woodward Building, Washington, D. C. It is for the council to determine what disposition shall be made of it.

By the will of the late George L. Beer the sum of $5,000 was bequeathed to this association to found a prize for the best essays in the history of the international relations of modern Europe. It is suggested that a committee be appointed to formulate rules for making award of the prize.

Questionable societies.—A committee consisting of the president, secretary, and treasurer of the association considered the question referred to them by the council of bringing suit against certain questionable societies. The committee was of the opinion that the expenses of such a suit were likely to be heavy and while they were in sympathy with the idea that such societies should be hindered by all possible legal means, they did not think it wise to use the funds of the association in supporting suits. The action of the committee has been approved by the council.

Affiliations.—The association is affiliated with the American Council of Learned Societies, and is represented in that body by Prof. Charles H. Haskins and Prof. J. Franklin Jameson. Professor Haskins has been elected chairman of the American Council. The work of this organization in obtaining the coordination of work by the various learned societies in the United States is highly important and it is felt that it should be supported to the extent of the ability of this association. The American Council of Learned Societies is affiliated with the Union Académique Internationale.

Vignaud.—November 24, the following cable message was sent to Henry Vignaud, in Paris, on his ninetieth birthday:

American Historical Association sends greetings, congratulations, best wishes.

Mr. Vignaud replied as follows:

Your complimentary cable reached me on the eve of my ninetieth birthday. I am much touched by this attention coming from an association where contributions to historical researches are invaluable and to which I am proud to belong. Very weak physically, I am otherwise in good health and still able to work. Please accept my thanks for your friendly cable and believe me, gratefully yours, Henry Vignaud.

JOHN S. BASSETT, *Secretary.*

DECEASED MEMBERS, 1920

Mrs. Robert Abbe.
George Louis Beer.
Edwin Cortland Bolles.
Helen Boyce.
Richard McCall Cadwalader.
Richard M. Colgate (life member).
Abner H. Cook.
Franklin Bowditch Dexter (life member).
William Sherman Doolittle.
Walter B. Douglas.
Joseph Elkinton.
James F. Failing.
Charles Allcott Flagg.
Sameul Swett Green (life member).
Charles F. Gunther.
Francis W. Halsey.
Edith Shutte Hurst.
Grenville Mellen Ingalsbe.
Robert Matteson Johnston.
Lester Maxwell.
Robinson Locke.
Thomas Hooker Loomis
Jesse Macy.
Anna Lenore Monroe.
Joseph Eugene Moore.
Henry S. Oppenheimer.
Thomas McAdory Owen.
Charles Lawrence Peirson.
Thomas R. Proctor.
Virginia Morgan Robinson (Mrs. J. Enders Robinson).
Frederic Schenck.
James Schouler (life member).
William H. Seward.
Arley Barthlow Show.
Francis W. Smith.
John William Venn-Watson.
Homer J. Webster.

Report of the Treasurer, November 30, 1920

The annual dues of the American Historical Association amount to $7,000. The interest on invested funds $1,400; and from miscellaneous sources comes about $150. The total receipts available for expenses are $8,550.

The expenses of the secretary's and treasurer's office are $3,000; the regular committees require $650; the publication committee uses $700; and the Historical Review, under the new prices, costs $8,000; making a total of $12,350. Added to this are the payments of $700 for prizes and the projects undertaken by the association, making a grand total of $13,050.

On this basis the deficit is $4,500. This deficit is made up of $3,000 increased cost of the Review over the cost for the current year: $700 increase in the office expenses; and $800 increase in the items of publications, program, and policy committees and the like.

If it were not for the increase in the cost of the Review, the voluntary contributions, amounting this year to $1,652.60, would cover the deficit. This increase of $3,000 may be partially offset in several ways. The Review receives payments by the publishers of $2,400 a year; it expends for contributions $1,500, leaving a balance of $900 which might be used toward the increased cost. The advertising may yield $1,000 under the new arrangement with the publishers recently entered into by the editors. This will still leave $1,100 to be raised from other sources

In the judgment of the treasurer, the Review should be left unhampered. Essentially it is the association, because to three-quarters of the membership it stands as their only connection with the organization. Only as a temporary expedient should payments be made from the editorial funds of the Review, and then only on the advice and consent of the board of editors. The advertising, however, is a field hitherto unworked. It is not capable of producing large revenues, but it may be made to bring in between one and two thousand dollars a year.

The ideal situation financially would be to have the dues pay for the Review and the running expenses of the association, leaving the income to be used for the projects undertaken by the association. As matters now stand, the dues do not cover the cost of the Review.

The expedient of asking a voluntary contribution of $1 has sufficed during the past two years; but even were the request to be made for $2 and were the response equally wide, their would still be a deficit.

If the dues were raised to $5 a year and the association suffered a loss of 500 members, the income would be:

From dues	$10,000
From investments	1,400
From miscellaneous sources	150
Total	11,550
The expenditures would be:	
Review	6,400
Office	3,000
Committees, prizes, and projects	2,050
Total	11,450
Leaving a balance of	100

Financial Statement November 30, 1920

Receipts:		
Annual dues	$6,990.27	
Life membership dues	150.00	
Registration fees	107.87	

Receipts—Continued.		
Interest on investments	$1,330.21	
Interest on bank account	39.64	
Voluntary contributions	1,652.60	
Royalties	49.70	
Sales of publications—		
Prize essays	60.23	
Papers and reports	24.40	
Writings on American History	12.75	
Directory	13.95	
Miscellaneous	51.50	
		$10,483.12
Gift from National Board for Historical Service (Andrew D. White fund)		1,000.00
Total receipts		11,483.12
Cash balance Dec. 1, 1919		5,184.72
		16,667.84
Expenditures:		
Secretary and treasurer	$2,754.43	
Pacific Coast Branch	45.05	
Committee on nominations	103.00	
Committee on membership	71.35	
Committee on program	259.30	
Committee on local arrangements	50.00	
Conference of historical societies	23.15	
Committee on publications	674.37	
American Historical Review	5,087.85	
Historical manuscripts commission	20.00	
Herbert Baxter Adams prize	200.00	
Writings on American History	200.00	
American Council of Learned Societies	122.85	
London headquarters	31.45	
Committee on policy	133.68	
American Council on Education	10.00	
		9,786.48
Liberty bonds purchased (par value, $2,000)		1,835.80
Accrued interest on Liberty bonds to date of purchase		14.40
Total expenditures		11,636.68
Cash on hand Nov. 30, 1920		5,031.16
		16,667.84

(Excess of net receipts over net expenditures, $696.64.)

Assets:		
General—		
Bank balance	$5,031.16	
Liberty bonds (par value, $31,450)	29,848.60	
Accrued interest on Liberty bonds	93.59	
Cash in Central Trust Co. of New York (endowment fund)	188.91	
		35,162.26
Publications in stock, estimate	6,195.00	
Furniture, office equipment, books, estimate	425.00	
		6,620.00
American Historical Review:		
Bank balance	1,321.40	
Liberty bonds (par value, $1,200)	1,131.64	
Accrued interest on Liberty bonds	6.38	
		2,459.42
		44,241.68

AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW—ANNUAL REPORT OF THE TREASURER, NOVEMBER 30, 1920

Receipts:		
Received from the Macmillan Co. for editorial expenses, as per contract	$2,400.00	
Interest on investments	51.00	
Interest on bank account	23.56	
		$2,474.56
Cash balance Dec. 1, 1919		967.42
Total receipts		3,441.98
Expenditures:		
Petty cash	138.18	
Printing, stationery, and supplies	142.75	
Binding	10.25	
Publications	34.07	
Travel	190.38	
Payments to contributors to Review—		
January number	349.00	
April number	369.75	
July number	397.25	
October number	367.00	
Additional payments to the Macmillan Co. of 5 cents per copy on account of July number of Review sent to members of the American Historical Association	121.95	
		2,120.58
Cash balance Nov. 30, 1920		1,321.40
		3,441.98

The assets of the Review in cash and securities are:

Cash on hand in Union Trust Co.	1,321.40
Liberty bonds (par value, $1,200)	1,131.64
Accrued interest on Liberty bonds	6.38
	2,459.42

CHARLES MOORE, *Treasurer.*

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN AUDIT CO.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, DECEMBER 20, 1920.
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: We have audited your accounts and records from December 1, 1919, to November 30, 1920. Our report, including three exhibits, is as follows:

Exhibit A.—Assets at November 30, 1920.

Exhibit B.—Statement of receipts and disbursements, general.

Exhibit C.—Statement of receipts and disbursements, American Historical Review.

We verified the cash receipts, as shown by the records, and the cash disbursements with the canceled checks and vouchers on file, and found the same to agree with the treasurer's report.

The cash on hand in the different funds was reconciled with the bank statements.

The Liberty bonds of the association were submitted for our inspection, and found to be as called for by the records.

Respectfully submitted.

THE AMERICAN AUDIT CO.
[SEAL.] By C. R. CRANMER, *Resident Manager.*

Approved:
HARRY M. RICE, *Vice President.*

Attest:
C. W. GORTCHINS, *Assistant Secretary.*

EXHIBIT A.—*Assets at November 30, 1920*

General:		
Cash on hand	$5,031.16	
Liberty bonds (par value $31,450)	29,848.60	
Accrued interest on Liberty bonds	93.59	
Inventories (not verified by the American Audit Co.)—		
Publications (estimate)	6,195.00	
Furniture, office equipment, books (estimate)	425.00	
		$41,593.35
American Historical Review:		
Cash on hand	1,321.40	
Liberty bonds (par value $1,200)	1,131.64	
Accrued interest on Liberty bonds	6.38	
		2,459.42
Endowment fund		
Cash on hand		188.91
		44,241.68

NOTE—No liabilities are reported other than small current bills, the amount of which is not known at this time.

EXHIBIT B.—*Receipts and Disbursements, December 1, 1919, to November 30, 1920*

Receipts:		
Annual dues		$6,990.27
Life memberships		150.00
Registration fees		107.87
Voluntary contributions		1,652.60
Publications		111.33
Royalties		49.70
Interest—		
Liberty bonds	$1,330.21	
Bank account	39.64	
		1,369.85
Miscellaneous		51.50
Gift from National Board for Historical Service (Andrew D. White fund)		1,000.00
Total receipts		11,483.12
Cash on hand Dec. 1, 1919		5,184.72
		16,667.84
Disbursments:		
Secretary and treasurer		2,754.43
Pacific Coast Branch		45.05
Committee on nominations		103.00
Committee on membership		71.35
Committee on program		259.30
Committee on local arrangements		50.00
Committee on historical societies		23.15
Committee on publications		674.37
Committee on policy		133.68
American Historical Review		5,087.85
Historical manuscripts commission		20.00
Herbert Adams Baxter prize		200.00
Writings on American History		200.00
American Council of Learned Societies		122.85
London headquarters		31.45
American Council on Education		10.00
Liberty bonds purchased (par value $2,000)		1,835.80
Accrued interest Liberty bonds to date of purchase		14.40
Total disbursments		11,636.68
Cash on hand Nov. 30, 1920		5,031.16
		16,667.84

EXHIBIT C.—*American Historical Review Receipts and Disbursements, December 1, 1919, to November 30, 1920*

Receipts:		
The Macmillan Co., per contract		$2,400.00
Interest—		
Liberty bonds	$51.00	
Bank account	23.56	
		74.56
Total receipts		2,474.56
Cash on hand Dec. 1, 1919		967.42
		3,441.98
Disbursments:		
Petty cash		138.18
Stationery, printing, and supplies		142.75
Contributors to Review		1,483.00
Binding		10.25
Publications		34.07
Traveling expenses		190.38
Macmillan Co. additional payment on account of July number of Review		121.95
Total disbursments		2,120.58
Cash on hand Nov. 30, 1920		1,321.40
		3,441.98

REPORT OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE

The undersigned have examined the above report of the treasurer of the American Historical Association as audited by the American Audit Co. and have found the same correct.

HERMAN V. AMES,
J. M. CALLAHAN.

DECEMBER 29, 1920.

REPORT FROM THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

The council has held one meeting during the year, beginning at 9.30 a. m., December 27. Through the omission of the meeting formerly held about Thanksgiving a large amount of business had been thrown over to this one meeting. It was necessary to hold five sessions of this meeting, in order to complete the work that came before the council. Provision made in accordance with a recommendation of the committee on policy, to be explained later in the report of that committee, will enable the council to take certain parts of its work in a form that may be disposed of without the necessity of crowding so much work in sessions held while the annual meetings are in progress.

By a vote of the association in 1915 the reports of the committee are submitted to the council, for approval or rejection, and then brought into the annual business meeting where they can be called up specifically by 10 members of the association. In accordance with this rule the reports of committees are present in this room. The following references are made to the contents of these reports:

The committee on London headquarters reported that the rooms occupied in London had been closed, and a balance of $16.27 returned to the treasurer of this association. The committee is discharged.

The board of editors of the American Historical Review reported progress through the year. On account of the resignation of Prof. D. C. Munro, Prof. Williston Walker was appointed to a place on the board.

No report was received from the board of editors of The Historical Outlook.

The committee on the Justin Winsor prize reported that it was unable to agree upon an award. The council ordered that the three highest papers be submitted to the committee appointed for 1921 with the request that they report as early as possible.

The committee on publications reported that the annual report for 1917 is about to be distributed. Materials for the report of 1918, in two volumes, should be ready for distribution within two months. The directory of membership will appear in Volume I of this report. The writings on American history, 1918, will also appear in this report. Separates of the directory and the writings will be issued at nominal prices. The annual report for 1919 will include the first instalment of the Stephen B. Austin paper's, edited by Prof. Eugene C. Barker, and designed as the fifteenth report of the historical manuscripts commission. On account of the slow sale of the prize essays, the total receipts of which were only $60.23 during 1920, the council authorized the committee on publications to dispose of the stock of these essays in the best manner possible. For storing and insuring these essays the cost for the year was $113.08.

The secretary of the committee on the historical congress at Rio de Janerio reported progress and the report was accepted.

The committee on the military history prize reported that the prize was awarded to Thomas Robson Hay for his essay on "Hood's Tennessee campaign."

The committee on membership reported the results of their efforts to enlarge the membership of the association, resulting in a net gain of 79 members. This is the first net gain in membership since 1915. The chairman of the committee, Professor Wertenbaker, was authorized to enlarge the membership of the committee by appointing associate members acting in conjunction with the secretary of the association.

The committee on bibliography of modern English history reported progress.

The committee on a manual of historical literature reported that plans have been made and cooperating bibliographers have been obtained to carry on the work vigorously. The council decided, in accordance with the recommendation of the committee on policy, to revive the committee on bibliography and to combine with it the present committee upon the manual of historical literature.

The council decided, in view of invitations previously extended, to accept the invitation to hold its annual meeting of 1921 in St. Louis. Considerations prompting this decision were the centennial celebration in St. Louis and the geographical position of that city, which makes it advisable that the next meeting of the association should be west of the Alleghany Mountains.

The historical manuscripts commission reported that the Stephen B. Austin papers to be published in the annual report of the association were being prepared, and an instalment had been delivered to the committee on publications.

The committee on history and education for citizenship in the schools made its report. The council voted that in discharging the committee at its own request the council desires to record its high appreciation of the committee's laborious service. The council referred the report of the committee to the new committee on history in schools.

The report of the conference of historical societies was received and approved.

No reports were received from the committees on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize and on bibliography, which were inoperative during the year.

The council recommends the creation of the following standing committees:

On obtaining transcripts from foreign archives.
On military history.
On patriotic societies.
On service.

and the following special committees:

On the documentary publications of the United States Government.
On the writing of history.
To formulate rules for the George L. Beer prize.
To cooperate with the Peoples of America Society in studying race elements in the United States.

Report of the Committee on Policy

Introduction.—The committee on policy was appointed by the council in 1917 for the purpose of preparing for consideration by the council a comprehensive program of scientific activities which the association might appropriately maintain or undertake. By reason of the various services which its members were called upon to perform in connection with the war and with the peace conference, the committee was prevented from entering actively upon its duties until the present year. A meeting of the committee was held at Branford, Conn., on September 13 and 14, 1920, the following members being present: Messrs. Haskins, Becker, Munro, and there being also present, by request of the committee, Messrs. Bassett, Moore and Leland, respectively secretary, treasurer, and ex-secretary of the association. The committee had before it a summary of the past and present activities of the association, prepared by Mr. Leland; a statement of the financial condition of the association, prepared by Mr. Moore; a letter of suggestions from Mr. G. S. Ford, an absent member of the committee; and a proposal by Mr. L. G. Connor respecting an enterprise in agricultural history.

The committee held four sessions and agreed upon the following conclusions and recommendations. By request of the committee Mr. Leland served as secretary.

1. *Annual meetings.*—The committee does not recommend any change in the present practice of the association with respect to the place and time of holding the annual meetings. It should, however, be observed that the practice of holding the meeting during the Christmas holidays is attended by certain difficulties, such as congestion of railroad travel, exposure to inclement weather, and interruption of family reunions, which would be obviated if some more favorable period were selected as a common vacation time by all educational institutions.

The committee believes that the meetings would benefit from the appointment of a standing committee on program. Such a committee might be composed of five members (it should not be much larger), three of whom should serve for terms of three years, so arranged that one member would retire each year, the other two to be appointed for a term of one year and to be selected with reference to the locality of the meeting during their term of service. It is believed that such a committee would be able to maintain such a degree of continuity or progression in the subject matter of the meetings as might be desirable. It should also anticipate significant historical anniversaries, not only in American history but in general history, and should especially endeavor to stimulate research by arranging sessions on research in the various fields of history, commencing with American history.

2. *Annual report.*—The annual report of the association has the status of a public document and is widely distributed, going not only to members of the association but also to the depository libraries in the United States and to the libraries, societies, and institutions in foreign countries which are included in the International Exchange Service. It is highly important that the report should be as representative as possible of the best work of the association. At present the report contains the following material:

The proceedings of the association, including the account of the meetings that appear in the April number of the Review, the minutes of the business meetings of the association and of the council, and the reports of officers and committees.

Proceedings of the Pacific Coast Branch.

Presidential address, reprinted from the Review.[3]

Papers read at the annual meeting which are not printed elsewhere and which are accepted by the committee on publications.

Papers read before the Pacific Coast Branch and offered by the executive committee of the branch.

Report of the public archives commission, with proceedings of the conference of archivists.

Report of the historical manuscripts commission.

Proceedings of the conference of historical societies.

Writings on American history.

Contribution of the Agricultural History Society.

The committee has no radical change to suggest in the contents of the report except in one particular. The number of papers read at meetings which find publication elsewhere than in the report appears to be increasing, with the result that the comparatively few papers which are included in the annual report are less and less representative. The committee recommends therefore that in place of the papers read at the meetings now printed and in place also of the general account of the meetings reprinted from the Review there be prepared and printed a scholarly summary or abstract of all the papers read at the meetings and not printed in the Review or in the report, and that the space thus saved be devoted to the publication of more fully developed contributions, such as have sometimes been printed in the past, which are too long for presentation in a periodical such as the Review.

The committee also recommends that writings on American history be again divorced from the annual report as soon as other arrangements for its publication can be made (see below, sec. 9), and it suggests that the report, rather than the Review, is the appropriate place for the publication of the presidential address, provided always that it is found possible to bring out the annual report within a reasonable time after the annual meeting. The present policy of indexing the reports with a view to publishing a cumulated index at suitable periods, say of 10 years, should be maintained. The committee especially urges the importance of making every effort to publish each annual report within as short a time as possible after the meetings to which it appertains, and in any event before the next annual meeting.

3. *Historical manuscripts commission.*—Soon after its establishment the council define the function of the historical manuscripts commission as the location, calendaring, and printing of historical manuscripts of historical significance which are in private hands and which are not likely soon to be placed in public depositories. This policy has not been consistently followed, for the commission has printed several collections which are in public depositories and has even printed groups of archival documents which do not fall within the category of historical manuscripts. The committee believes that the function of the commission as originally defined is the proper one, and that the location and calendaring of historical manuscripts should receive special attention, while the printing of material in public depositories should be avoided. The committee recommends that the commission make an especial effort to cooperate with the Library of Congress in locating material suitable for acquisition by the Manuscript Division. The committee also recommends that the commission give further consideration to the plan, set forth in its report of December, 1916, of locating and publishing fugitive Revolutionary material in private hands. Other classes of material to which attention might be given are the letters of American historians, the records of home missionary societies, etc.

4. *Public archives commission.*—The public archives commission has completed, so far as practicable, its original program of preparing and printing reports on the

[3]Now omitted from the report.

archives of the several States. The committee believes that the commission should be continued for the practical service it can render to the development of archive economy and practice in the United States. The commission should serve as a clearing house of information respecting archival matters and its reports should contain a summary of American legislation respecting archives, together with notes of important developments both in this country and abroad. The commission should continue to organize annual conferences of archivists, as part of the annual meetings of the association, and should be charged with the preparation of the primer of archive economy now confined to a special committee.

5. *Committee on the national archives.*—The erection in Washington of a building for the national archives and the organization of their administration are matters of the utmost importance to all students of American history, and the association has from its earliest days frequently manifested its deep interest therein. The present standing committee on the national archives, consisting of members residing in Washington, should be maintained and should receive the utmost support that the association can give it.

6. *Committee on securing transcripts from foreign archives.*—The Library of Congress is engaged in securing from the archives of foreign countries transcripts of those documents most important for the history of the United States. In this work the Library has at various times asked for the advice of members of the association, and the program of copying in the British archives was drawn up by a subcommittee of the public archives commission. The chief of the Manuscript Division has requested that the association appoint a permanent advisory committee to aid the division in the selection of material to be transcribed. The committee accordingly recommends that such a committee be established, composed, naturally, of those members of the association who have the fullest acquaintance with the material in question.

7. *Committee on the documentary historical publications of the United States Government.*—In 1908 a special committee of the association prepared an elaborate report on the systematic publication by the National Government of series of historical documents. This report was printed as Senate Document 714, Sixtieth Congress, second session, and was distributed to members of the association; the committee on policy believes that, if possible, results should be obtained from the important and exceedingly valuable work of this committee. It is recommended, therefore, that the committee be reappointed and charged with the consideration of methods by which its program, or some part thereof, may be carried out.

8. *Bibliography.*—The committee recommends that the standing committee on bibliography be continued and that it be charged with completing and publishing the bibliography of American travel which has been long in process of compilation. The committee should also be charged with the part which the association has, in cooperation with the American Library Association, in compiling a manual of historical literature to take the place of the manual, now out of date, compiled by C. K. Adams. While the selection of new enterprises in bibliography must mainly be left to the discretion of the committee, it is nevertheless recommended that work be commenced on a check list of collections in American libraries relating to the World War; that the committee consider the desirability of continuing the bibliography of the publications of American and Canadian historical societies, compiled to 1905 by Mr. A. P. C. Griffin; and especially that the committee should institute a series of bibliographical notices of special collections of historical material, printed or in manuscript, in American libraries, at the same time undertaking or otherwise providing for the preparation of catalogues or calendars of certain classes of material.

The committee also recommends that the work of compiling and publishing, in cooperation with English scholars, a bibliography of modern English history, be pushed to completion in charge of the special committee which now has it in hand.

9. *Writings on American History.*—The committee believes most strongly in the continuance of the annual bibliography of Writings on American History which is perhaps the best annual national historical bibliography currently published. It is to be regretted that the recent publishers of the volume feel unable to carry it on and the committee feels that it should not be printed in the annual report if some other means of publication can be found. The committee recommends that the various questions connected with the compilation and publication of Writings, especially its financial support both from contributions and from sales, be fully considered anew and that every effort be made by the association to make this enterprise as self-sustaining as possible and to discover some dependable means of guaranteeing any avoidable deficit. The committee especially urges that every effort be made to insure the prompt publication of the volume, feeling that the delay it now suffers seriously detracts from its value and makes more difficult the question of its support.

10. *History teaching in the schools.*—The committee has a strong sense of the importance of maintaining the interest of the association in the various problems connected with the teaching of history in schools. Having in mind the influence which the reports of the associations's committees have had in this field, the committee is of the opinion that the standing committee on history in the schools should be reconstituted in order that the association may have a body to which may be referred for report the various questions with respect to history teaching which come before it. Such a committee should be not only a committee of reference but should also initiate investigations appropriate to its field. Emphasis is laid, however, on the desirability of requiring the committee to submit to the council any report which it is proposed to put forth embodying the findings or opinions of the committee, and inferentially of the association. This rule should also be applied with respect to the special committee on history and education for citizenship in the schools, which is now engaged in the preparation of its report.

11. *Historical societies.*—The committee desires to emphasize the importance of maintaining cordial, sustained, and effective relations with the various State and local historical societies of the country. The conference of historical societies which was inaugurated in 1904 as a regular feature of the annual meetings should be continued. The reorganization of the conference which was agreed upon in 1916, the details of which are to be found in the annual report of that year (pp. 232–235), was designed to stimulate the conference to greater activity and to provide for a larger degree of cooperation with historical societies. The committee has no specific recommendations to make under this head, thinking it better to wait until the effect of the reorganization referred to can be known.

12. *Patriotic societies.*—A conference of hereditary patriotic societies was held as part of the meetings of 1916, which requested the council to appoint a committee composed of representatives of the societies and of the association for the purpose of preparing definite suggestions respecting cooperation in the various lines of historical work. The council appointed a special committee of three, one of whom has since died. The committee has not as yet presented a report. It is strongly recommended, in view of the possibilities of important and effective work, that the committee be reconstituted and charged with the preparation of a report in the near future.

13. *Military history.*—Having in mind the recognition given by the agencies of the Government to the claims of history, as attested by such developments as the creation of the Historical Branch of the General Staff, the committee recommends that there be appointed a standing committee on military history, the chief function of which should be to advise and cooperate with the Historical Branch and with other governmental agencies, national and State, which are engaged in preparing histories

of the war. The committee should include a representative of the Historical Branch and a representative of the National Association of State War History Organizations.

14. *Agricultural history.*—The committee favors the maintenance of the existing arrangement with the Agricultural History Society, although it hopes that the time will come when the society may be able to maintain a publication of its own instead of depending upon space in the annual report of the association. The committee has considered a proposal laid before it by Mr. L. G. Connor, of the Agricultural History Society, for the establishment of a central bureau for gathering, compiling, and editing data relating to American agricultural history. The committee believes that the association should authorize this enterprise, provided the necessary degree of cooperation with the Department of Agriculture can be secured, and provided that the considerable funds necessary for so large an undertaking can be obtained without any obligation upon the association.

15. *Historical studies.*—The committee has taken into consideration the desire expressed by many members of the historical profession for some means of publishing historical studies which because of their length, technical character, or special nature are unsuited to existing historical periodicals; the committee has also considered the proposal, developed at some length in 1916, for the establishment of a review devoted to European history. The committee is strongly of the opinion that a further medium of publication of historical contributions is desirable; that such a medium should be established and maintained by the association; and that it should attract largely but not exclusively contributions in European history. The committee is, however, convinced that it is not expedient to establish a European history review. Such a review would inevitably duplicate in certain of its departments the work now satisfactorily performed by the organ of the association, the American Historical Review, and the committee believes that it would be preferable to devote the corresponding additional energy and financial support to enlarging the present Review. The committee proposes that there be established, by means of subscriptions and a guarantee fund, a quarterly publication bearing some such title as "Historical Studies," or "American Studies in History," or "Studies of the American Historical Association," which, omitting reviews and notes, shall be devoted exclusively to historical contributions of the highest scholarship, but of rather more technical or special character than the articles usually published in the Review and not subject to the limitations as to length which it is necessary to apply to the articles in the Review.

16. *Prizes.*—The committee recommends that the prize in military history offered this year be known as the Robert M. Johnston prize, in memory of the late Professor Johnston, whose generosity and interest in military history made the offering of the prize possible. The committee recommends that the prize hereafter to be offered annually, in accordance with the Beer bequest, for an essay in the history of recent European international relations be known as the George Louis Beer prize, in memory of the distinguished donor.

The committee raises the question whether further modification of the rules governing the competition for the Winsor and Adams prizes may not be desirable in order more specifically to encourage research by those who have already obtained the doctorate.

17. *American Council of Learned Societies.*—The committee believes that the association is to be congratulated on the part it has been able to take in the organization of the International Union of Academies and of its American member, the American Council of Learned Societies. In the opinion of the committee no more effective way can be found for the association to contribute to the advancement of the humanistic studies and to cooperate with other associations of scholars, both abroad and in

this country, than through the union and the council. Both should be supported to the extent of the association's ability, and the Andrew D. White fund, inaugurated by the National Board for Historical Service and turned over to the association for aiding the latter to take part in the enterprises of the union and of the council, should be enlarged as it is found possible to do so. The committee believes that one of the most useful of domestic enterprises which the American Council of Learned Societies could undertake would be the editing of the long-desired Dictionary of American Biography, and the committee recommends that the council of the association call the attention of the association's delegates in the Council of Learned Societies to this matter.

18. *University center for higher studies in Washington.*—In 1916 the council approved the plan drawn up by a special committee for establishing in Washington a residential center for higher studies in history, economics, and political science, which should be under the control of those departments of the various universities contributing to the support of the center. The committee believes that this plan is the best that has been proposed for encouraging historical research in Washington, and trusts that means may be found for putting it into execution.

19. *Advisory committee on activities.*—The committee recommends that the council appoint a standing advisory committee, the function of which should be to lay before the council from time to time proposals to the end that the association may always be possessed of a well-considered, balanced program of appropriate activities. The advisory committee should meet at least once a year, in addition to any meetings it might hold during the annual meetings of the association, and should invite the secretary and treasurer of the association to meet with it.

20. *Committee on service.*—In accordance with the previous note of the council there should be established a standing committee on service, the chairman of which should, in the absence of a salaried secretary of the association, be chosen from among the members residing in Washington. The function of the committee should be to establish relations of service with the various departments of the National Government, to answer such queries relating to historical matters as may be reviewed from time to time by the association, and in general to make more available to the public the services of the association and of historical scholarship.

21. *Finance*—The committee realizes keenly that it is of little use to plan a program of scientific activities unless adequate financial support is assured. In the present state of the association's exchequer the annual income from dues is entirely absorbed by the payments for the American Historical Review and by expenses of administration. The only income available for scientific work is that derived from the invested funds, which now amount to a little over $30,000. It is clear that a vigorous and sustained campaign for an increased endowment must be entered upon. The association should have a salaried secretary who could devote all his time to its affairs, and for this alone a special endowment of at least $100,000 is needed. Further endowment sufficient to assure an income of $10,000 for scientific activities alone should be secured. These are, perhaps, ideals difficult of attainment, but they should never be lost from sight, and every year should see the association appreciably nearer to them. In the meantime the committee recommends the appointment of a standing committee on endowment which should push immediately and actively, by every possible means, the raising of an adequate endowment for the association's work.

In view of the greatly increased expenses of the American Historical Review, the actual printing expenses of which now cost $2.88 per annum, it is plain that the association must take active measures to increase the income received from each member. The least that can be done would be to raise from $1 to $2 the amount

annually requested from each member in addition to his dues. It is for the council to decide whether this is sufficient or whether it may not be necessary to advance at once the annual dues to $5.

CHARLES H. HASKINS, *Chairman.*
CARL BECKER.
WILLIAM E. DODD.
GUY STANTON FORD.
DANA C. MUNRO.

DECEMBER 11, 1920.

APPENDIX

ACTIVITIES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION 1884–1920

MEMORANDUM FOR THE COMMITTEE ON POLICY

By Waldo G. Leland

[September, 1920]

1. *Pacific Coast Branch.*—The Pacific Coast Branch was organized in 1903, in order that members of the association living in the far West might have more convenient opportunities for holding meetings than those afforded them by the annual meetings of the association. The branch, which embraces the membership of the association residing in the Mountain and Coast States, chooses its own officers and committees, arranges for its own meetings, and carries on such activities as it sees fit. Its members however, pay their annual dues into the general treasury, which in turn makes a small annual appropriation for the administrative expenses of the branch. The executive committee of the branch selects certain of the papers read before it for inclusion in the annual report of the association.

2. *Agricultural History Society.*—The Agricultural History Society was organized in Washington in 1919, with the aid of local members of the association. A temporary arrangement has been effected between the society and the association whereby the principal literary meeting of the former is held as a session of the annnal meetings of the latter. The association has agreed to publish in its annual report from 200 to 300 pages of material supplied by the society, subject to the approval of the committee on publications. The society is represented informally in the council and on the program committee of the association.

3. *American Society of Church History.*—In 1896 the American Society of Church History united with the association as a church history section. The arrangement was not wholly satisfactory, partly because the membership of the church history section was largely of the East, and the annual meetings of the association were not always conveniently located for it, but more especially because the governmental connection of the association made it impossible for the latter to print in the annual reports papers dealing with church or religous history. The section was dissolved in 1903 and the American Society of Church History was reorganized as an independent organization, being incorporated under the laws of New York. A joint session of the two societies was held during the annual meetings of 1917.

4. *Mississippi Valley Historical Association.*—In 1907 the newly organized Mississippi Valley Historical Association applied to the council to be made a branch of the association similar to the Pacific Coast Branch, but the council voted that it was inexpedient to establish a branch in the Mississippi Valley. The only relation between the two organizations is an arrangement whereby they hold a joint session presided over by the president of the Mississippi Valley Association as part of the annual meetings of the American Historical Association.

5. *Southern History Association.*—In 1890 a joint committee of the American Historical Association and the Southern History Association reported to the council a plan for the discontinuance of the latter, the transfer of its records and publications to the American Historical Association, and the merging of the membership of the smaller body in that of the larger by the payment of the usual membership dues. The association was to maintain a standing committee for the promotion of historical study in the South. No action was taken in the matter.

6. *Foreign headquarters.*—In 1913 headquarters were established in London in the building occupied by the Royal Historical Society, the association assuming a proportionate part of the rental of the building, at an annual cost of $150. The purpose of this move was to provide an attractive center for American students in England and for English students interested in American history. With the establishment on a permanent basis of the American University Union this object was attained in another way and the headquarters were discontinued early in the present year (1920). Plans were on foot in 1914 to establish similar headquarters in Paris, where the Minister of Public Instruction had offered accommodations, but the war prevented them from being carried out.

7. *American Council of Learned Societies.*—The association is a member of the American Council of Learned Societies organized in 1919–20 for the purpose of enabling American societies devoted to the humanistic studies to have an effective participation in the International Union of Academies, in the organization of which body the delegates of the association had had an important part. The association has two delegates in the council, one of whom is the present chairman of that body, and pays an annual fee of 5 cents for each member. The association has received from the National Board for Historical Service a fund of $1,000, known as the Andrew D. White fund, the income of which is to be devoted to aiding it to carry on its share of the work of the council. Ten other societies are at present members of the council.

8. *Meetings.*—The annual meetings of the association have always been regarded as one of its most important activities. Thus far meetings have been held in Saratoga, Boston, Providence, New Haven, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Richmond, Columbia, Charleston, New Orleans, Buffalo, Detroit, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Chicago, Madison, and San Francisco. Until 1895 the meetings were usually held in Washington, but since then they have been held in rotation in such a way as best to suit the convenience of the members of the association. The rotation of East, West, and Washington, adapted in 1898 was abandoned, so far as Washington was concerned, in 1909. The attendance at the meetings ranges from 300 to 500, the larger figures generally being secured in Boston, New York, Washington, and Chicago.

The first program committee was appointed for the meetings of 1890, when for the first time the practice of grouping the papers according to subject was adopted. In 1895 was inaugurated the practice of holding simultaneous sessions, in order to accommodate the increasing variety of interests. In 1904 so-called round-table conferences were instituted for the purpose of providing opportunity for informal discussion. Dinner and luncheon conferences are a more recent innovation, and have become a regular part of the meetings.

The subjects to which sessions are devoted vary from year to year and reflect the current or temporary interest of the public and of the historical profession. What may be called a normal program, however, usually includes sessions or conferences on ancient, medieval, modern European, English, and American (including Latin-American) history, as well as conferences of archivists, of historical societies, and of teachers of history, and joint sessions with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association and with the Agricultural History Society.

9. *Historical congresses.*—The association has taken part, by sending delegates (at their own expense), in various historical congresses, notably the international congresses of Rome, 1903, Berlin, 1908, and London, 1913, the Congress of Archivists in Brussels, 1910, the historical congress of the Norman Millenary in Rouen, 1911, and various congresses of the Americanists. Of South American congresses, now being held with increasing frequency, the association has been represented at the Congress of History and Bibliography in Buenos Aires in 1916, and has accepted an invitation to take part in the congress to be held in Rio Janeiro in 1923 in celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of Brazilian independence.

10. *Historical celebrations.*—The association has not pursued any definite policy with regard to the celebration of historical anniversaries. The annual meetings of important anniversary years have generally included papers pertinent to the occassion, but only once does the association appear to have taken the initiative in calling attention to an approaching anniversary; in 1886 a special committee waited upon President Cleveland to ask him to represent to Congress the desirability of a suitable celebration of the Columbian quartercentenary. Participation in anniversary celebrations has usually been upon invitation from their organizers.

11. *Annual report.*—The annual report of the association has the status of a public document. It is transmitted to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, who submits it, or such part of it as he may see fit, to Congress for publication. The association is allowed 2,000 copies. The Smithsonian Institution distributes it to foreign libraries and institutions through the International Exchange Service, and the Superintendent of Documents distributes it to the depository libraries in this country.

The annual report usually contains from 1,000 to 1,200 pages and is generally printed in two volumes. The association has been allowed such reprints from the report as it may have required. The publication of the report is under the direction of the committee on publications and is the chief function of the editor of the association, who serves as secretary of the committee. A cumulative index to papers and reports was printed as Volume II of the report for 1914, and the current indexes are now being made with a view to their cumulation at intervals of 10 years. At present the annual report normally contains the following:

Proceedings of the association, including the account of the meetings printed in the Review, the minutes of the business meeting and of the council, and the reports of officers and committees.
Proceedings of the Pacific Coast Branch.
Presidential address.[4]
Papers read at the annual meeting which are not printed elsewhere, and which are accepted by the committee on publications.
Papers offered by the executive committee of the Pacific Coast Branch.
Report of the public archives commission, with proceedings of the conference of archivists.
Report of the historical manuscripts commission.
Proceedings of the conference of historical societies.
Writings on American history.
Contributions of the Agricultural History Society.

12. *Historical manuscripts commission.*—The historical manuscripts commission was established in 1895 after an unsuccessful effort to secure congressional legislation creating a governmental commission. The policy of the commission, so far as it has been defined, has been to locate, calendar, and print historical manuscripts of national significance in private hands, not likely soon to be placed in public depositories. This policy has not been consistently followed. Since the first years of the commission's existence no systematic effort has been made to locate collections of papers in private hands, and there has been almost no calendaring of the

[4]Printed in the Review. Now omitted from the report.

sort that characterizes the reports of the Royal Historical Manuscripts Commission. Of the collections of documents printed in the annual reports several do not fall within the category of historical manuscripts in private hands. Two of them, the Texan Diplomatic Correspondence and the Despatches of the French Commissioners to the United States, are public archives rather than historical manuscripts. Other collections, such as the Chase papers, the Van Buren autobiography, and the Austin papers, are in public depositories and might conceivably have been published by other agencies. The Calhoun, Bayard, and Hunter, and the Combs, Stephens, and Cobb collections are, however, well within the category indicated.

At the present time the commission has in press the Van Buren autobiography and the first of three volumes of Austin papers, and has in preparation a volume of letters to Calhoun. Some years ago the commission formnlated a plan for collecting as widely as possible and printing Revolutionary letters and papers in the possession of individuals, but this plan has not been carried out.

The commission joined with the Library of Congress some years ago in preparing and printing a set of suggestions for the editing and publication of original documents.

13. *Public archives commission.*—The public archives commission was organized in 1899, its function being to report on the character of the historical archives of the several States and of the United States, and on the means taken for their preservation and publication. After an unsuccessful effort to secure an appropriation of $5,000 from Congress for carrying on its work the commisson decided to confine its attention to the archives of the States. Adjunct members were appointed to represent the commission in the various States and they undertook to prepare descriptive reports on State archives. In this way reports have been made on the archives of over 40 States. These reports vary greatly in character, from the most summary accounts to detailed inventories. The work has been done without remuneration other than the reimbursement of expenses incurred in travel and for clerical assistance.

The commission has also published several bibliographies of printed archival material and lists of special classes of documents, such as Bibliography of the Printed Archives of the Original States; List of Representations and Reports of the Board of Trade; List of the Journals and Acts of Colonial Legislatures; List of Commissions and Instructions to Colonial Governors, etc.

Through a subcommittee the commission has directed the work of transcribing documents from the British archives for the Library of Congress.

Since its establishment the commission has carried on a persistent propaganda for appropriate legislation respecting archives designed to insure their preservation and their proper administration and utilization, and it is not too much to credit the commission with most of the advance in such matters that has been achieved in the United States during the last 20 years. Furthermore, the commission has been able, through participation in the Congress of Archivists in Brussels in 1910 and through the annual conferences of archivists which it instituted in 1909, to inculcate and encourage in this country the best methods of archive administration.

The commission has never published documentary material, the council having decided adversely in that matter.

At present the commission is in a state of suspended activity. A primer of archive economy, planned by the commission, is now being prepared by a special committee of two, one of whom is the chairman of the commission.

14. *Federal archives.*—The association has, from its first meeting in Washington, been concerned for the safe-keeping, proper administration, and historical utilization of the Federal archives. Special committees have been appointed on the subject, and Congress has frequently been memorialized. There is reason to hope that a national archives' building may be erected in the not too distant future. The

association has a standing committee whose principal function is to watch the situation in Washington and exert whatever influence it may have to secure proper provision for the archives. The committee consists of the chiefs of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution, of the Manuscript Division in the Library of Congress, and of the Historical Branch of the General Staff.

15. *United States historical documentary publications.*—In 1908 a special committee was appointed, which received the status of a subcommittee of the governmental committee on department methods, to consider the question of systematic publication by the Government of historical documents from its archives. The committee drew up a plan for such publication and embodied it in a careful and comprehensive report which was presented to Congress by President Roosevelt and printed. No further action has been taken in the matter.

16. *Bibliography.*—The bibliographical output of the association has been varied and large. It commenced with bibliographies, 1889–1892, of members of the association compiled first by Paul Leicester Ford and later by A. Howard Clark; A. P. C. Griffin's Bibliography of Historical Societies was commenced in the annual report for 1890, its final edition being printed as Volume II of the report for 1905. In 1894 the council voted to expend not more than $500 in securing "systematic bibliographies representing the progress and condition of American historical science."

In 1898 a standing committee on bibliography was appointed, and under its direction were compiled most of the bibliographies which have appeared in the annual reports. It was influential in securing the compilation and publication of J. N. Larned's Literature of American History; it published a trial edition of a Union List of Collections on European History in American Libraries (Princeton, 1912) and took charge of the Bibliography of American Travels, which was commenced by a special committee and which now, comprising about 4,500 titles, is awaiting final editing and publication. The committee commenced work on a finding list of historical periodicals in American libraries, a task which has been taken over by the Library of Congress, and prepared a list of American historical periodicals which was published in the annual report for 1916. The committee has been suspended for lack of funds to enable it to carry on any systematic work, but the chairman of the committee has been authorized to cooperate with the American Library Association in the compilation of a new bibliography of general history to take the place of the Manual of Historical Literature published by C. K. Adams.

17. *Writings on American history*—Writings on American History is an annual bibliography compiled and published since 1906 under the auspices of the association, which subscribes $200 each year to a fund to which other historical societies and some individuals also subscribe. The compilation is under the direction of Dr. J. F. Jameson and is performed by Miss Grace G. Griffin. For some years the Yale Press has brought out the annual volume at a net loss, but it has now been obliged to give up its publication, and the bibliography will appear as part of the annual report of the association.

18. *Bibliography of modern English history.*—A conference on research in English history, held during the meetings of 1908, requested the council to appoint a committee on the preparation of a bibliography of modern English history along the lines of the work by the late Charles Gross for the earlier period. The council appointed such a committee, which at once secured the cooperation of a group of English scholars, and the work of compilation was planned and commenced. By 1914 the American collaborators had completed their contribution to the first two of the three volumes which it was proposed to publish, but the project was interrupted by the war, and the committee was authorized by the council to suspend its activities. In 1919 the chairman of the committee was authorized by the council to secure if possible the resumption of work on both sides and to push for the comple-

tion of the bibliography. The association holds in trust a gift of $125 which the committee secured toward the expense of publication.

19. *History teaching in schools.*—(*a*) Committee of seven. In 1896 the association appointed a committee of seven to prepare and recommend to the National Education Association a plan of historical studies in secondary schools. The final report of the committee was published in 1899, The Study of History in Schools (Macmillan), and has had an influence of first importance upon history teaching.

(*b*) Committee of five. In 1907 the committee of review of college entrance examinations asked for a new definition of the field of ancient history and for the reconsideration of certain other points in the report of the committee of seven concerning college admission requirements. A committee of five was appointed to deal with the request and in general to review the report of the committee of seven. The new committee prepared a report which was accepted by the council and was published as a supplement to the report of the committee of seven, and also in the annual report of the association for 1910.

(*c*) Committee of eight. A conference on the teaching of history in the elementary schools which was held as part of the meetings of 1904 requested the council to appoint a committee to investigate and report to the association on a course of history for the elementary schools and on the proper training of teachers. In response to this request the committee of eight was appointed which held conferences at successive meetings of the association and presented a report which was published in 1909, The Study of History in the Elementary Schools (Scribner's Sons).

(*d*) Committee on qualifications of teachers of history. In 1910 a conference of teachers of history in normal schools and teachers' colleges requested the council to appoint a committee on the qualifications of teachers of history in high schools. As a result of this request, a committee was appointed the principal activity of which was to encourage discussion of the subject by teachers' associations and similar bodies. The committee did not attempt to establish any standard qualifications for history teaching and presented no formal report. It was discontinued in 1913.

(*e*) Committee on history in schools. In 1914 a standing committee on history in schools was appointed for the purpose of dealing with any matters in its field that might come before the association. The first matter to be referred to it was the request from the College Entrance Examination Board for a fuller definition of the requirements in history. The committee held various conferences and carried on much correspondence, but the war interrupted its work, and it did not present any report. It was suspended in 1919.

(*f*) Joint committee on history and education for citizenship in the schools. In the early part of 1919 the National Board for Historical Service, at the request of the National Education Association, appointed a "reconstruction" committee on history in the schools. The object of the committee was to prepare a complete report on the study and teaching of history in all schools below the grade of college, having in mind the conditions brought about by the war. This committee, with additions, was adopted by the council as a committee of the association. The National Board having ceased to exist, the committee is no longer a joint one. The committee has held a large number of conferences in various parts of the country and has presented tentative reports. It is expected to present its complete report at the coming meeting of the association.

20. *History teaching in colleges and universities.*—No systematic consideration has been given to the subject of the study and teaching of history in colleges and universities. Frequent conferences have been held in connection with the annual meetings for discussing certain aspects of the subject, such, for example, as the first year in history, the requirements for the doctorate, the teaching of oriental history, etc. Two informal dinner conferences in 1917 and 1919 have discussed the teach-

ing of the history of the Far East, and a committee appointed at these conferences has had the subject under consideration, but this is an activity within rather than of the association.

21. *Historical Outlook.*—The History Teacher's Magazine was founded in 1909 as a private enterprise. In 1911, on recommendation from the board of editors of the American Historical Review, the association took the magazine under its auspices, giving it an annual subsidy of $600, securing an equal amount for it from other sources, and appointing an advisory editorial board. In return for this support the publisher supplied the magazine at half rate to the members of the association and of the history teachers' associations. This arrangement was continued, but the subsidy was later diminished to $400 and then to $200. During the war, with the aid of the National Board for Historical Service the magazine became self-supporting and the subsidy of the association was withdrawn, as was also the reduction in the subscription rate to members of the association. The title of the magazine was changed to Historical Outlook in order that the pedagogical element in the publication might not appear too prominent. In 1919 the council, at the request of the editor, appointed a board of editors.

22. *Historical societies.*—In 1885 the association voted to urge upon its members residing in the newer parts of the United States the desirability of organizing and maintaining local historical societies; thus from its beginning the association has displayed the keenest interest in the welfare of State and local historical organizations. In 1889 a list of historical societies was printed in the papers, and in the same year the council directed the officers to communicate with the State historical societies expressing the desire of the association to cooperate with them and to exchange publications, inviting them to send representatives to the next meeting of the association, and requesting of each society a brief account of its origin, history, organization, publications, collections, and activities in general.

In 1897 a special session of the meetings was devoted to historical societies, and a plan of affiliation between State and local societies and the association was offered to the council but was not acted upon. In 1898 the general committee was established, one of whose functions was to consider the relations between the association and other historical societies. In 1904 a subcommittee of the general committee was authorized to prepare a report on the best methods of organization and work on the part of state and local historical societies. This report, carefully prepared, was published in the annual report for 1905.

The most important development in the relations of the association with local and State societies was the inauguration, in 1904, of the annual conferences of historical societies for the discussion of problems and for the planning of cooperative activities. The conference is now a semi-independent body, electing its own officers, except for the secretary who is appointed by the council and who ranks as a committee chairman, preparing the program of its meetings, and in general conducting its own affairs, always under the auspices of the association. This reorganization of the conference dates from 1917 but has not yet been fully effected, especially as regards financial support from the societies which belong to the conference. The conference particularly desires the publication of a handbook of American historical societies and agencies and the continuation of A. P. C. Griffin's bibliography to the present date. The proceedings of the conference are at present printed in the annual report of the association.

The principal cooperative activity undertaken by the conference has been the calendaring of documents in French archives relating to the Mississippi Valley. A fund of $4,000 was raised for this work; the exploration of the archives has been practically completed and the calendar is being edited by the Carnegie Institution, which proposes to publish it.

23. *Patriotic societies*—A conference of patriotic societies was held in connection with the meetings of 1916 and requested the council to appoint a committee to prepare definite suggestions for methods of cooperation between the association and the patriotic societies in various lines of historical work. A committee of three was appointed in 1917.

24. *European-historical societies.*—In 1910 a committee was appointed to consider the preparation of a report on the work of European historical societies. The committee printed in the annual report for 1911 a list of European societies but with no details respecting them. The committee reported that in its opinion a list of European societies with such information respecting their organization, governmental connection, publications, activities, etc., as might be useful to American societies and scholars was a desideratum.

25. *Military history.*—A conference on military history was held as part of the meetings of 1912 and appointed a committee on military history. This committee was confirmed by the council and became one of the committees of the association. The committee arranged a second conference on military history as part of the meetings of 1913 and presented a report on the status of the study of military history in the United States. The committee was enlarged to be a committee on military and naval history, but it made no further reports and was discontinued in 1915. The committee, or at least certain members of it, should be credited with the founding of the Military Historian and Economist which was edited for a short time by the late Professor Johnston and Col. A. L. Conger and which was suspended in 1917 when the editors were sent overseas in the military service. The committee also had an important part in preparing the way for the establishment, in 1917, of the Historical Branch of the General Staff.

26. *Revolutionary records.*—Following action by the council in 1913 and the holding of a special conference in Washington in 1914, a committee of five was appointed to act in an advisory capacity to the National Government in locating, copying, and publishing the military and naval records of the Revolution. The committee functioned for about a year, rendering valuable service to the War and Navy Departments, until the failure of appropriations caused the work to be stopped. Much material was gathered, largely from the archives of the original States, but none of it has been published.

27. *Prizes.*—(*a*) Justin Winsor and Herbert Baxter Adams prizes. In 1895 the association voted to offer a prize of $100 for the the best historical monograph, exclusive of university dissertations, based on original investigation; and also voted to establish a medal of equal value to be awarded at suitable intervals for the best published work of historical research. The second vote was not carried into effect, but the prize of $100 was awarded in 1896 to Dr. Herman V. Ames. The offer of a cash prize was renewed and thereafter it was called the Justin Winsor prize. Upon the death of Herbert B. Adams, who left an unrestricted bequest of $5,000 to the association, the Herbert Baxter Adams prize in European history was established. Thereafter each prize was increased to $200 and they were awarded in alternate years for unpublished essays only. The essays were at first printed in the annual reports, but in 1909 their publication in a separate series was commenced. The cost of publication increased rapidly while the sales of essays tended to remain at a low figure, so that after a short time the association found itself incurring an annual deficit of between $500 and $1,000. Publication of the essays was discontinued in 1917, unless by consent of author and the committee on publications they should be included in the annual report, and printed essays were admitted to the competition.

(*b*) Military history prize. The late Prof. R. M. Johnston made an anonymous gift to the association of $250, to be used as a prize for the best monograph in the field of military history that should be offered in a competition held by the association.

The competition has several times been extended but was finally closed on July 1 of the present year.

(c). George L. Beer prize. The late George L. Beer left a bequest of $5,000 to the association on condition that the income from it should annually be offered as a prize for the best essay dealing with European international relations since 1895.

28. *Aids to research.*—In 1912 the council appointed a committee to consider methods of promoting research in American and European history. The committee recommended the establishment of a standing committee on aids to research and of a special committee on the formation of a research fund. It was proposed that the former should prepare a list of funds available for historical research, should receive and pass on applications for aid, should recommend applicants to institutions having funds, and should allot grants from funds which might be secured for the purpose by the special committee. The committee was discharged in 1915 and no further action was taken in the matter.

29. *Historical studies in Washington.*—The association has long concerned itself with encouraging historical research in the governmental collections in Washington. In 1901 a committee was appointed to consider a proposal by Dr. J. F. Jameson for the establishment of a school for historical studies in Washington. This committee reported and was discharged, its place being taken by a committee on the promotion of historical research in Washington. At this time (1902) the Carnegie Institution of Washington was founded and the members of the committee, together with the board of editors of the American Historical Review, succeeded in securing the establishment in the institution of the Deparment of Historical Research. No provision was made, however, for bringing students to Washington or for giving them instruction.

In 1915 a conference was called at Columbia University which resulted in the formation of a plan for the establishment in Washington of a university center for higher studies in history, economics, and political science, which should serve as an adjunct to those departments in the contributing universities. The plan has been approved by the councils of the historical and political science associations, but it is held in abeyance until adequate funds can be secured.

30. *Colonial entries in the Privy-Council register.*—In 1907 the association contributed $250 toward the expense of transcribing and publishing the colonial entries in the register of the Privy Council.

31. *Original narratives of early American history.*—In 1902 the council approved the publication, under the auspices of the association but without expense to it, of the series of reprints since published by Scribner's Sons under the title "Original Narratives of Early American History." The general editor was Dr. J. F. Jameson, who made annual reports to the association while publication was in progress.

32. *Reprints relating to European history.*—In 1907 the council appointed a committee to consider the policy of publishing a series of reprints relating to European history similar to the series of Original Narratives noted above. No report was made.

33. *Calendar of printed letters relating to American history.*—In 1908 a committee was appointed on the compilation of a calendar of printed letters relating to American history, with instructions to draw up a plan of work and to secure the necessary cooperation. No report was made.

34. *Documentary history of the States.*—In 1913 Prof. E. S. Meany presented to the council a project for the publication of a documentary history of the States, one volume for each State, for which the prospective publishers desired the support of the association. The project was referred to the executive committee of the Pacific

Coast Branch for consideration and report as concerns the Pacific States only. No report has been made.

35. *Legal history.*—In 1897 a committee was appointed to inquire into the "feasability of instituting a section devoted to historical jurisprudence or legal history," but no further action was taken in the matter.

36. *Historic sites.*—In 1906 the general committee commenced an inquiry into the marking of historic sites, but did not conclude it. In 1909 a special committee of five was appointed which gathered considerable material relating to various sections of the country, but which did not complete its report. The material gathered and the partial reports were turned over to the secretary of the association, and the committee was discharged.

37. *Historic highways.*—In 1915 a committee of one was appointed at the request of the National Highways Association to cooperate with that body in selecting appropriate names for the historic highways of the country. The committee was successful in securing a considerable degree of cooperation from the various States historical societies and and agencies.

38. *Historical study of colonies and dependencies.*—From 1898 to 1900 there was a special committee on the historical study of colonies and dependencies. It cooperated with a similar committee of the Economic Association, outlined a series of reports, and held a conference during the meetings of 1899. It reported its inability to carry out the program it had set for itself, and was discharged. The net results of its activities consist of a few papers printed in the annual reports and the Review, to which may be added as a collateral result the volume by Prof. A. L. Lowell on Colonial Civil Service.

39. *American year book.*—In 1909 Prof. A. B. Hart was appointed a committee of one to confer with representatives of other associations respecting the publication of an American yearbook of history, economics, and politics. The project was carried through and the volume has appeared annually since 1910.

40. *Monographic history of the United States.*—In 1900, after favorable report by a special committee, the council recommended that a committee of five be appointed to arrange for the publication under the auspices of the association of a cooperative monographic history of the United States. The proposal met with opposition in the business meeting and was abandoned so far as the association was concerned. It was after carried through as a private enterprise.

Report of the Board of Editors of the American Historical Review

The principal question apart from routine that occupied the board this year is the cost of production of the Review. The Macmillan Co. reported that under our contract with them they had published the Review during the last three years at a loss of approximately $3,000. This, of course, can not continue. The possible means of retrenchment are a considerable reduction of the size of the Review, the use of cheaper paper, or less payment for articles and reviews. The first of these, a reduction in the size of the Review, has already been made. The other two measures the board did not feel to be wise. Some increase in the income from advertising seemed possible and steps have been taken to secure this addition. None of these are, however, adequate to restore the balance, and the board recommends to the executive council an increase in payment to Macmillan to 70 cents per number delivered to the members of the association.

The board takes pleasure in reporting an increase in the productivity of American historical scholarship, so far as this can be tested by the number of articles submitted for publication in the Review, as compared with the paucity of articles during the war years. In this connection the board calls attention to the series of

three articles analyzing much of the recently published documentary materials concerning the outbreak of the war, prepared at their request by Prof. S. B. Fay.

The board begs to remind the council that the term of Prof. J. H. Robinson as one of the editors of the Review expires at this time.

Respectfully submitted.

E. P. CHEYNEY, *Chairman.*

REPORT OF THE HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS COMMISSION

The work of the commission was completed some time ago for a considerable time in advance, and therefore it has been unnecessary to take any action recently.

The manuscript of Doctor Barker's first volume was placed in the hands of the committee on publications some months ago, as I understand, and he is doubtless at work on the second volume.

Respectfully submitted.

JUSTIN H. SMITH, *Chairman.*

NOVEMBER 18, 1920.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUSTIN WINSOR PRIZE

The committee on the Justin Winsor prize has been reduced from five to four members, by the inability of Professor Hodder to serve. The four remaining members have given careful examination to four essays submitted in the competition, and are unable to agree that any one of them is entitled to receive the award.[5]

FREDERIC L. PAXSON, *Chairman.*

DECEMBER 20, 1920.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS

Mr. Allen R. Boyd, as editor, has submitted to me a statement covering his first year's work, the substance of which I give in the two following paragraphs.

The annual report for 1917 is about to be distributed. Materials in the annual report for 1918 will fill two volumes and should be ready for distribution within two months. Besides the records and articles to which attention was called in my last report, Volume I will contain the first careful directory of our membership printed since 1911 and the annual bibliography "Writings on American History, 1918," compiled by Miss Grace Gardiner Griffin. The bibliography by Miss Griffin is the thirteenth number of a continuous series, opening with 1906. Six independent volumes, bibliographies for 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1917, have appeared, it will be remembered, through the public-spirited efforts of the Yale University Press. Last spring, however, the Yale University Press decided to abandon the project. Accordingly your committee concluded that the annual report might readily be utilized to carry on this useful aid to American historical scholarship. Separates of both the directory and the "Writings" will be issued at nominal prices. Separates of the other contents of Volume I have already been issued in advance of the completed volume. The annual report for 1919 will fill two volumes, for, besides containing materials afforded by the Cleveland meeting, it will include (in Volume II) the first instalment of the Stephen F. Austin papers edited by Prof. Eugene C. Barker and designed as the fifteenth report of the historical manuscripts commission.

Owing to the great increase of expense in printing, Mr Boyd calls attention to the need of watching closely the size of our volumes. The committee must consequently be granted authority to exercise its judgment in cooperation with the editor in this matter and to eliminate, if necessary, or to restrict some things offered for publication.

[5] The council decided to defer action on the award until the next meeting.

In view of the large amount of time spent by the editor on this year's work—a great mass of material having accumulated—I ask that an additional sum of $100 be given him for this, his first year's labor. Mr. Boyd has been tireless in his reading of proof, giving freely of his time to a multitude of details, and has proved in a variety of ways to be a most conscientious and efficient editor.

The Herbert Baxter Adams prize of $200 was awarded in 1919 to Dr. William Thomas Morgan, assistant professor of European history in Indiana University, for his monograph entitled, "English Political Parties and Leaders in the Reign of Queen Anne, 1702–1710" (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1920, pp. 427). Efforts are still being made to have published without expense to the association Dr. F. L. Nussbaum's essay on "E. J. A. Ducher," which was awarded the Adams prize in March, 1918. If these efforts prove unsuccessful, the association will be bound, I think, to print the book. This will mean, according to very recent estimates, an appropriation of $1,000.

Figures on the sale of our publications for the year are not encouraging, as the following comparisons show:

Publications sold 1916–17, $542; 1917–18, $260.06; 1918–19, $503.59; 1919–20, $161.03. Of the total receipts only $60.23 came from the sale of our prize essays. Against these small receipts is this year's cost of storing and isuring the prize essays—$113.08. In other words, we are losing this year $52.85 on this item. I recommend that the chairman of your committee, the editor, and the treasurer of the association act as a special committee of three in disposing of this stock of prize essays promptly, giving to the 10 authors first an opportunity of taking over all but 10 copies of their respective essays at a low cost such as may seem fair to the special committee. By this means we may be able to settle a problem which is something of a menace constantly to our treasury. The annual appropriation of your committee was $750. Of this amount $674.37 has been spent in various ways, leaving a balance of $75.63.

The projected volume of historical essays in commemoration of 25 years' services of the American Historical Review (1895-1920) has had to be abandoned. The special committee fulfilled last year its assigned task of making selection for the volume. But in May, 1920, it was found to be impossible to secure its publication without expense to the association, owing to the conditions existing in the book trade.

Respectfully submitted.

H. Barrett Learned, *Chairman.*

Report of Committee on Membership

The committee on membership began its activities in April, 1920. Since the geographical distribution of the committee made a meeting impracticable, Mr. Leland, Professor Bassett, Professor Zook, and the chairman met in conference in Washington March 8 to decide upon a plan of campaign.

The first step was to divide the country into districts and to assign one to each member of the committee. Thus each commstteeman was held responsible for the task of increasing the membership in his own district. To Prof. L. F. Brown was assigned New York; to Prof. E. H. Byrne, Wisconsin and Iowa; to Prof. A. C. Krey, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming; to Prof. F. E. Melvin, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Colorado; to Prof. R. A. Newhall, Connecticut and Rhode Island; to Prof. J. S. Orvis, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine; to Prof. C. W. Ramsdell, Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Arkansas; to Prof. J. C. Randall, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Florida; to Prof. A. P. Scott, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan; to Prof. E. J. Van Nostrand, California, Oregon, Washington, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, New Mexico, Arizona, and Montana; to Prof. G. F. Zook, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and West Virginia; to Prof. T. J. Wertenbaker, New Jersey.

Since the plan outlined entailed a large amount of work it was suggested that each member of the committee appoint as many associate members to assist him as he deemed advisable. As with the committeemen, so the associate members were to be made to feel that they were personally responsible for a certain part of the work, either in a geographical district or with a certain group of persons.

Especial efforts were directed toward securing recruits among graduate students, and it was suggested that graduate teachers in the larger universities, especially in the summer schools, would be the proper persons to work this field. An attempt was made also to increase the membership of the association among persons not teachers or writers of history but who are deeply interested in its study. It was thought certain that there are many men and women in the country, persons of leisure often, who are voluminous readers of history, or are especially interested in some phase of history who, if properly approached, would gladly join the association.

To facilitate this work Mr. Leland and Professor Bassett revised and brought up to date a short sketch of the association published some years ago. A number of copies of this pamphlet with a supply of application blanks were sent to each member of the committee.

To supplement this work, upon the advice of the secretary, a list of names was selected from Writings on American History for 1917, to whom copies of the sketch of the association and application blanks were sent out from the secretary's office.

Although the results obtained during the year were not all that had been desired on the whole encouraging progress has been made. For the first time since 1916 a stop has been put to the annual loss in membership and a substantial gain recorded in its place. The total number of additions from December 31, 1919, to December 6, 1920, was 266, while the total loss was 205, leaving a net gain of 61. In 1916 there was a net loss of 187, in 1917 of 85, in 1918 of 35, in 1919 of 74. It is, then, a matter for congratulation that the tide has definitely turned, and that a beginning has been made in the important work of repairing the losses attendant upon the war. It is to be hoped that another year will see more substantial progress and that soon the record total of 2,926 members attained in 1915 will be equaled or even surpassed.

Respectfully yours,

T. J. Wertenbaker, *Chairman.*

Report of the Conference of Historical Societies

The secretary of the conference of historical societies has been concerned during the past year with three lines of activity: (1) The preparation of a program for the meeting of the conference in connection with the annual meeting of the American Historical Association at Washington, D. C., in December, 1920; (2) the circularizing of the societies for the sake of obtaining funds and information; (3) the effort to make constructive plans for rhe future of the conference.

A joint session with the National Association of War History Organizations was planned for 1920; and, cooperating with Dr. Albert E. McKinley, secretary of the latter association, a joint program was formed. Believing that the question of federation of historical societies within the States is most vital to the interests both of the conference and its individual members, Dr. Joseph Schafer, of the Wisconsin State Historical Society, has been asked to read a paper on this subject. Discussion will be participated in by Mr. Worthington C. Ford, of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Prof. Harlow Dindley, of Earlham College, Indiana, and Prof. Edmond S. Meany, of the University of Washington, thus representing three geographical sections of the country.

In accordance with the annual custom of the conference, a circular letter and a questionnaire have been sent out, with the kind assistance of the general office of the American Historical Association. The letter includes an invitation to the

societies to send delegates to the meeting at Washington (for which preliminary programs have been enclosed) and also calls attention to the provision of the constitution regarding the financial support of the conference through assessment upon the member societies. The questionnaire asks for the usual data upon the organization and activities of the individual societies. The secretary hopes to be able to report to the conference at its meeting on December 28 an encouraging response to this letter, both in financial returns and information.

With regard to the future, the question of organization deserves first attention. The secretary believes the present constitution, drawn up in 1916, contains a satisfactory working plan for the conference. The actual financial support received is going to depend somewhat upon the evidence which the conference gives to the societies of its value to them. The value of its services likewise is going to depend much on the financial support received. The secretary has faith that the two factors can be made to stimulate each other rather than interfere with each other.

He feels, however, that organization can be pushed one step further to advantage, although not through formal addition to the constitution. The four to five hundred societies scattered over this country and Canada have potentially much in common, but practically make few points of contact. The conference strives to give them a common focus, but close relationship is impossible especially with the smaller local societies. The secretary believes that for the good of the conference as a whole, and for the more vital functioning of the societies individually, there should be a bond organized between the societies within each State and Province. The conference need not cease dealing directly with the small society, but in many cases, for example in the preparation of bibliographical material or in making a survey of any kind, the officers of a federation within a State could render invaluable service to the Conference in an advisory capacity, and often in securing information or action from the smaller societies which the secretary of the conference might never obtain. Furthermore, the historical interests of each State would profit greatly by such a federation. This principle is not a new one before the conference. It has been made the subject of an earlier meeting, but it is, in the opinion of the secretary, of too great importance to be neglected. It is with this in mind that Doctor Schaefer's paper was arranged and it is hoped that the paper and its discussion may have definite results.

Probably the most difficult problem of any historical organization is that of publication. The secretary feels strongly that the proceedings of the annual meetings of the conference, together with the data collected from the societies, should be published in separate form and without delay. The publication of this material by the American Historical Association in its annual reports is greatly appreciated, but it is doubtful if the interest of the societies in sending in answers to the questionnaires can be sustained without earlier report both of the proceedings and data. This is the first publication duty of the conference and should have prior claim on the finances.

Two other projects have been for some years before the conference—a handbook of information regarding the societies and a continuation of the Griffin Bibliography of American Historical Societies. Each is important and each is a somewhat formidable undertaking.

These two projects were broached in 1916 and efforts were made to procure data for their preparation; the Newberry Library agreeing to allow Mr. A. H. Shearer, then secretary of the conference, the time to devote to this work. But financial, military, and other circumstances prevented consummation of the plans year after year. In December, 1919, when the present secretary took office, there existed an unusually large collection of data sent in by the societies in answer to questionnaires of 1917 and 1918 and in anticipation of the publication of a handbook. It seemed wise rather than hold this longer, to publish it in the report of the American Historical Association for 1917, and the retiring secretary kindly agreed to send the reprint of this report out to the societies explaining that this increased collection of statistics,

covering over 400 societies, was the nearest approach possible to a handbook under the present conditions, and announcing the change of officers of the conference. Owing to the delay in the appearance of the report this letter was not sent out, but the reprints have recently been mailed to the societies.

It is the opinion of the secretary that a fresh start should be made in the direction of both handbook and the Griffin continuation.

The secretary has received a letter from his predecessor in office to the effect that he is sending a collection of material relative to the conference with regard to these two and other projects. In this, he states, there is material collected by him from Iowa and Virginia toward the Griffin bibliography, and he has had promises from Minnesota, New York, and Illinois. Thus a start has been made.

It seems, however, as if the wisest thing to do would be to ask the conference to name a carefully chosen committee of three to act with the secretary of the conference in planning the details of a handbook and in compiling and publishing it, and to name a similar committee to act with the secretary of the conference in compiling a continuation of the Griffin bibliography. These committees should have working chairmen and the committees could each divide their work as was done in the preparation of the survey of the work of historical societies made in 1905 by a committee consisting of Messrs. Thwaites, Shambaugh, and Riley.

The secretary of the conference could act as a coordinating agency between the two committees, could assist both committees, very materially in connection with sending out questionnaires and in the collection of data, and, as far as his other duties would permit, in every way possible.

With regard to the financing of these publications, it must be said that the treasury of the conference justifies little outlay, and the returns from the societies are a matter of prophecy. The secretary believes that a sufficient amount will be received, together with the balance on hand, to get out the proceedings and annual data in separate form and take care of the circularizing of the societies at least once during the coming year.

If the handbook and the continuation of Griffin's bibliography are printed in the reports of the American Historical Association, the expense to the conference will not be great and can probably be handled by the receipts from the societies if they become assured of definite and satisfactory publication results.

It is believed that more satisfactory returns will be secured if two circular letters are sent out annually, one in the early part of the year giving a general report of the December meeting, announcing the publication of the annual survey and other activities, and calling for the annual dues; and a second one in November announcing the December meeting and requesting information based on a questionnaire. In this way the request for dues will be associated with the objects for which financial support is necessary, and will be freed from the complication of the return of questionnaire data.

For the year 1921, in view of the fact that the certainty of adequate returns from the societies is not yet assured, it is requested that the American Historical Association again make an appropriation of $25 for the conference.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

The secretary has received from his predecessor in office, Mr. Augustus H. Shearer, $26.74, which sum remains on deposit in an account opened for the conference of historical societies. The conference was also granted in December, 1919, by the American Historical Association, an appropriation of $25. This sum has not been drawn, but expenses connected with the sending out of the circular letter and questionnaire to the societies have been paid by the general office of the American Historical Association as follows:

Duplication of letter and questionnaire (paper supplied by duplicating company)	$18.15
Postage	5.00
	23.15

It is understood that these items have been charged against the appropriation of $25 on the books of the American Historical Association. The assistant secretary of the association states that an additional small bill for services in connection with the circular letter—probably about $5—was due but had not yet come in when the books were closed. This will be taken care of in 1921.

Aside from the above there have been no disbursements. The call for dues was sent out in the circular letter of December 1, 1920, and as yet no returns have been received with the exception of the sum of $10 from the State Historical Society of Iowa. The actual amount in the treasuary of the conference is therefore the balance brought forward from 1919 plus the above item, or $36.74.

JOHN C. PARISH, *Secretary.*

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL ARCHIVES

In the last session of Congress it was found impossible to persuade the House Committee on Appropriations to make any appropriation for the national archive building. In the session now begun a more hopeful situation appears to exist, due mainly to the efforts of Mr. Moore, of this committee. There appears to be a disposition in Congress to institute a regular program of building operations in Washington, and in framing it to follow the recommendations of the building commission. That commission has given a foremost place to the national archive building in its suggestions as to a proper order for the erection of buildings, and Senator Smoot, in recent remarks in the Senate, speaking for that commission, declared strongly in favor of taking up the erection of that building first.

Respectfully submitted.

J. F. JAMESON, *Chairman.*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MODERN ENGLISH HISTORY

The committee on a bibliography of modern English history regrets that it is not in a position to make a definitive report. Shortly after the committee was reconstituted at the last meeting of the association, correspondence was begun with Mr. George W. Prothero, who had been appointed general editor and who had collected much material for the first volume just before the outbreak of the war. Mr. Prothero asked for a postponement of decision in plans until he had fulfilled some postwar responsibilities toward the British Government, which he thought would be by the autumn. With the completion of this work Mr. Prothero's health suddenly failed, and he was ordered to enter upon an immediate and complete rest for six months. It was impossible for the American committee to decide upon a policy before Mr. Prothero left England, and the chairman's last letter to him remains unanswered. Nothing has therefore been done to block out a course of action for the immediate future.

It is evident, however, that something should be done to examine and arrange the materials Mr. Prothero has left in London and to prepare them for his resumption of work. The committee believes that a grant of $150 from the association for the coming year, if it can be made, will enable them to bring the materials now in existence into order ready for a resumption of active preparation for the publication of the first volume of the work.

Respectfully submitted.

E. P. CHEYNEY, *Chairman.*

Final Report of the Committee on the Military History Prize

It will be recalled that at the Charleston meeting, in 1913, it was announced that a friend had donated $250 to the association, to be awarded as a prize for the best essay in American military history, the details of the competition to be determined by the association. The council appointed the following committee to prepare plans and conduct the contest: Capt. A. L. Conger, Army Service Schools, Fort Leavenworth, chairman; Milledge L. Bonham, jr. (then of Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge); Allen R. Boyd, Library of Congress; Fred M. Fling, University of Nebraska; and Albert Bushnell Hart, Harvard University.

A circular was prepared and distributed, announcing the contest for 1915. Five essays were submitted, none of which, in the opinion of the committee, was worthy of the award. Accordingly it was recommended to the association at the Washington meeting of 1915 that no award be made. This recommendation was adopted and the same committee was continued in the service to conduct another contest.

In consequence of Captain Conger's being ordered to join his regiment on the Mexican border in May, 1916, a vacancy was created, which was filled by the appointment, by the council, of Prof. Robert M. Johnston, of Harvard, editor of the Military Historian and Economist, as chairman.

Another circular was prepared, arranging for a contest in 1918. But in June, 1918, Professor Johnston was appointed a major in the Historical Section of the General Staff, United States Army, and sent to France. He resigned from the committee and Mr. Bonham was appointed chairman, and the vacancy filled by the appointment of Prof. Frank M. Anderson, of Dartmouth College.

As every member of the committee was engaged in war work of some sort, and the historical profession was not then primarily interested in previous military events, it was unanimously decided to postpone the contest until after the war.

After the armistice was signed, the committee resumed its work, and upon the suggestion of Mr. Boyd wide publicity was given to the announcement of the contest and an effort made to interest officers of the allied armies in this contest. A circular was distributed, fixing July 1, 1920, for the closing of the contest. At the Cleveland meeting of 1919, the committee met and decided upon plans for handling the essays. The chairman, meanwhile, had removed to Hamilton College.

By July 1, 1920, eight essays were submitted, on subjects ranging from the colonial wars to the World War. Seven of the contestants were men, one a woman. Both the historical profession and the Army were represented, as well as the business world.

From July 1 to December 15, 1920, the essays were being carefully considered by the members of the committee. After much correspondence, and at least one personal conference between members, it was decided, after some hesitation, that in view of the fact that this was not a permanent competition, and because of the probability of the fund being covered into the treasury if not awarded, that a decision had better be made.

The committee awarded the prize to Mr. Thomas Robson Hay, of Pittsburgh, Pa., for his essay, "Hood's Tennessee Campaign." Mr. Hay was advised to make certain revisions before publishing it. A sketch of Mr. Hay has already been sent to the secretary of the association. Honorable mention was accorded to the following essays: "The Texas Rangers in the Mexican War," by Prof. Walter Prescott Webb, of the University of Texas; "What Happens in Battle," by Capt. John Nesmyth Greely, General Staff, United States Army.

Notice of this decision was given to the council by Mr. Boyd during the Washington meeting of 1920. The result has since been reported by the chairman to the contestants, and the essays are being returned to them.

All of which is respectfully submitted by the committee, with the request that it be discharged.

In conclusion, I desire to express my appreciation of the zeal and scholarly attitude of the other members of the committee, and to thank the council and other officers of the association for their courteous and efficient cooperation with the committee.

A statement of the expenses connected with this contest is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted.

MILLEDGE L. BONHAM, JR., *Chairman.*

Expenditures of the members of the committee:

Mr. Anderson: For dispatching the essays to Mr. Hart		$1.00
Mr. Boyd: For dispatching the essays to Mr. Anderson		.83
Mr. Hart: For dispatching the essays to Mr. Fling		1.20
Mr. Bonham: For correspondence as chairman, 1918–1921	$3.75	
For dispatching essays to Mr. Boyd, July 2, 1920	.45	
For dispatching essays to Mr. Boyd, August 21	.35	
For return of essays from Mr. Fling, Jan. 12, 1921	1.07	
		5.62

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE HISTORICAL CONGRESS AT RIO DE JANEIRO

Although there has been no meeting of the committee in the course of the past year owing to the absence of some of its members from the United States, there has nevertheless been considerable headway made by correspondence. In the absence of Prof. Bernard Moses, the chairman of the committee, it was deemed advisable to designate Prof. P. A. Martin, of Stanford University, as acting chairman. The committee has been in close touch with various officials of the Government who are interested in the proposed congress and have given valuable assistance in the preparation of our plans. We have been particularly indebted in this regard to. Dr. L. S. Rowe, Director General of the Pan American Union, Mr. Sumner Welles, acting chief of the Division of Latin American Affairs of the Department of State, and Ambassador Edwin V. Morgan, who has been made a member of the committee and has taken an active part in its work thus far.

I had the pleasure of a brief visit in Rio early in June and was then able to confer at length with the officials of the Instituto Historico which has charge of the arrangements. The plans for the congress have been laid out along rather broad lines to include geographic and economic as well as historical investigations. This has evidently been thought desirable in view of the interests of the Instituto in the fields mentioned. It may be noted incidentally that the library of that organization is unusually strong in the literature on explorations and discoveries; hence the desire to include geographic contributions. It is to be hoped, therefore, that the American delegation to the congress may have among its members one or two geographers, and your committee is endeavoring to facilitate such an arrangement.

While the Instituto has thus far received acceptances from only six or seven national historical associations of as many American republics, it has ample assurances that the attendance at the congress will be large and comprehensive. There are some 30 sections or sessions on the tentative program, one of which is devoted to the history of the United States. It is suggested, however, that so far as possible the papers submitted shall emphasize the relations between the United States and Brazil.

Your committee is now considering the designation of delegates and the suggestion of topics for papers. It was originally hoped that some contribution toward the expenses of the delegation might be secured from the Government, and tentative representations were made along that line. It now seems unlikely, however, that

such assistance will be forthcoming, and for that reason the delegates who will actually make the trip to Rio in September, 1922, will probably be compelled to meet their expenses from their own resources or from those of institutions with which they are connected.

Respectfully submitted.

JULIUS KLEIN, *Secretary.*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORY AND EDUCATION FOR CITIZENSHIP IN THE SCHOOLS

Your committee on history and education for citizenship in the schools, which reported progress at the meeting of the council in Cleveland on December 29, 1919, desires at this time to make a supplementary report covering the activities of the committee since the Cleveland meeting.

During the sessions of the American Historical Association at Cleveland your committee held several meetings which resulted in the adoption of decisions concerning its future work, which decisions were published in the Historical Outlook for March, 1920, volume 11, no. 3, pages 111–112. A summary of these decisions would be as follows:

1. It was agreed that the committee should prepare, as Part I of its final report, recomendations for the four-year high-school course.

2. *Minimum requirements.*—That these should include, as a minimum requirement for graduation on the part of all pupils taking a four-year course:

(*a*) A course in modern world history (except America), beginning aproximately at the middle of the seventeenth century and extending to the present.

(*b*) A course in American history, treated topically, covering mainly the period from 1789 to the present, with special emphasis on the period since the Civil War.

This course should be primarily political, but it should take full account of economic, industrial, and social factors which explain political movements.

3. *Allocation in grades.*—That the above courses should be given, preferably, in grades 10 and 11, respectivly.

4. *Other social studies.*—In addition to this minimum requirement, the committee recomends, as additional required courses, where practicable:

(*a*) For the ninth grade a course in industrial organization and civics which shall include "the development of an appreciation of the social significance of all work, of the social value and interdependence of all occupations, of the opportunities and necessity for good citizenship in vocational life, of the necessity for social control, governmental and otherwise, of the economic activities of the community, of how government aids the citizen in his vocational life and of how the young citizen may prepare himself for a definite occupation." In this connection, we suggest the study of 10 great industries, as follows: The fisheries and fur trade; lumbering; meat, hides and wool; wheat; corn; cotton; iron and steel; coal; gold, silver and copper; and oil.

(*b*) For the twelfth grade a course in the problems of American democracy. This should include some of the basic principles of economics, political science and sociology, stated in elementary terms, but should consist mainly of the study of concrete present-day problems illustrating these principles.

The committee hopes to secure the cooperation of organizations of economists, political scientists, and sociologists in preparing syllabi for the above courses.

5. *Electives in history.*—It is by no means the intention of the committee to suggest a reduction in the time usually alloted to history in the high-school program. It is rather the intention, while retaining in full force and effect the list of history offerings in the high school, to increase the positive requirements in social studies for graduation as a guaranty of citizenship training. In addition, therefore, to the above required courses, the committee recommends the offering in the future as in the past of a variety of elective courses in history and the other social studies. It is not necessary that elective history courses should be taken in strictly chronological order.

The following are the courses suggested:

(*a*) The ancient world to about 800 A. D. This course should be so placed in the program as not to interfere with the required courses outlined above.

(*b*) A survey of ancient medieval history to approximately the middle of the seventeenth century. If convenient, this should be taken before the required course in modern world history of the tenth grade.

(*c*) The history of England and the British Empire.

(*d*) A course involving an intensive study of local, State, or regional history, or of some particular period or movement in the history of the Americas.

(*e*) A similar course involving an intensive study of some particular period or movement in European history. This might well take the form of the study of the background and history of the Great War.

(*f*) An intensive study of the recent history of the Far East.

6. *Syllabi.*—For the proposed required courses the committee agreed to prepare syllabi containing list of topics, references for the use of the teacher, and reading list for the pupils. No such syllabi were contemplated for the suggested elective courses, the committee agreeing, however, to facilitate as far as possible the publications and use of syllabi already in existence covering such courses.

Other recommendations.—By reference to the detailed statement in the Historical Outlook as cited, it will be seen that the committee covered in its decisions at Cleveland the question of the junior high school, the first eight grades, and insurance in civics. It was decided to defer the preparation of courses for the first eight grades and for the junior high school—apart from the work of the ninth grade, which is applicable both to the last year of the junior high school and the first year of the four-year high school—to a later time, meantime setting out to prepare the syllabi covering the four years of the high school, to be published as Part I of the final report.

On account of the preoccupation of the members of the committee with other pressing work for which they were responsible, it became evident early in the summer of 1920 that it would be necessary to employ some assistance if the committee expected to have its promised syllabi ready for final revision at the time of the Washington meeting. In consultations held on the subject it was agreed to employ Miss Frances Morehouse, of the University of Minnesota, to work particularly upon the ninth grade course in civics and in industries and upon the eleventh grade course in American history. These are the two courses for which the chairman of the committee made himself responsible, but which, after the assumption of his new duties as superintendent of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, it was impossible for him to work out unaided. The chairman therefore outlined the two courses briefly, indicating the plan which he understood the committee to have authorized in each case. These notes were placed in the hands of Miss Morehouse, and she, in consultation with the chairman, worked out the courses in detail. It was agreed, after conference with Mr. Leland, who was secretary and treasurer of the National Board for Historical Service, to pay to Miss Morehouse for her services the sum of $300 out of the funds which had been appropriated by the American Historical Association for the use of this committee. I respectfully suggest that the council make provision for the payment to Miss Morehouse of the sum so stipulated.

Of the other required courses, Mr. Knowlton, of our committee, made himself responsible for the tenth grade course in modern world history. My advices are that Mr. Knowlton will be prepared to present to the committee at Washington a syllabus covering his recommendations for that course.

Mr. Knowlton has also been experimenting at the Lincoln School of Teachers College, Columbia University, with a civics course for ninth-grade pupils. He will probably present a syllabus covering his conception of that course, which, in that case will be considered as an alternative to the course prepared by Miss Morehouse under the suggestions of the chairman of the committee.

It has been the hope of our committee that some other committee, or some individual, would prepare a course suitable for the suggested social science work of the twelfth grade. It is understood that Miss Morehouse and others at the University of

Minnesota have been at work upon a course of that description, and there are reports, that others also have had such courses under preparation. It is possible, but not certain, that at the Washington meeting we shall be apprised of the existence of a course which may meet the approval of our committee so that it can be recommended for use in connection with the courses for which the committee holds itself directly responsible.

The courses for the earlier grades and the junior high school.—The chairman has been creditably informed that Prof. Henry Johnson, on whom the committee has relied very largely in making its suggestions for the earlier years, has already prepared courses covering portions of the first eight years, and that the publication of these courses has been contracted for. More definite information, however, will doubtless reach the committee during the Washington session.

The proposed history investigation.—It has been suggested, in letters from the treasurer of the association and from Mr. Leland, former secretary, that there is now a prospect of securing a considerable fund for the scientific investigation of history teaching. If the council or the association shall take steps to procure such a fund, the question of the relation of the present committee to the proposed investigation will need to be settled, probably at the Washington meeting. The chairman has not conferred, except incidentally, with other members of our committee relative to this subject. However, he is convinced that in case such a fund is secured and an investigation undertaken, it ought to be undertaken by a new committee, the members of which shall be so situated as to be able to devote a considerable portion of their time to the work, since under those circumstances they can be compensated for their time. It is possible that some members of our committee might desire to be continued on the new basis. But certainly the majority are men who are fully occupied in work which precludes the employment of any considerable portion of their time in such an investigation, and for these members others would have to be substituted. The most economical plan and the one which the chairman will recommend to the committee will be to ask the American Historical Association to discharge the present committee on history and education for citizenship and to provide for the appointment of a new committee to be constituted as the association may determine.

Conservation of the work which has been done.—With reference to the courses which have been prepared, in the form of syllabi, in so far as these may be approved by the committee for publication with a view to their introduction into the schools of the country, I hope the council may feel disposed to favor their publication for temporary use until such time as the new committee, if appointed, shall be prepared to substitute more scientifically prepared courses for them. Your committee has, in the past two years, devoted considerable time, thought, and energy to the preparation of these high-school courses, and it would seem uneconomical to allow all of this work to be dissipated, particularly at a time when high schools in many parts of the United States are clamoring for leadership in the organization of their history and civics courses.

Summary.—To summarize I should say:

1. The committee hopes to agree upon at least three courses at the Washington meeting.
2. These three courses will be the courses for the ninth, tenth, and eleventh years.
3. In case of agreement, these three courses should be subjected to editorial preparation for publication, and should be published.
4. Such editorial preparation for publication might well be left to the new committee which it is presumed will be appointed by the American Historical Association to conduct a scientific investigation into the subject of history teaching.
5. The present committee of eight should be discharged.

JOSEPH SCHAFER, *Chairman.*

Resolved, That the committtee ask the council for permission to publish its final report to embody: (1) A fairly definite outline of the reorganized program for the 12 years as embodied in the June, 1919, issue of the Historical Outlook; (2) a straightforward statement justifying the program; (3) syllabi of certain selected topics and courses embodied in the program which will be put forth not as final recommendations but merely as suggestive of the detailed treatment that might be accorded to the various parts of the program.

Report of the Committee on a Manual of Historical Literature.

After considerable correspondence conducted with representatives of both the American Historical Association and of the American Library Association in 1919, the present committee was formally appointed at the Cleveland meeting in December, 1919, to assume charge of the work. The American Library Association is represented on this committee by Doctor Shearer, who is also a member, by appointment, for the American Historical Association. The American Library Association is ready to cooperate in any way desirable in the work, but is willing to leave the prosecution of the enterprise in the hands of this committee of the American Historical Association.

At the meeting in Cleveland the committee was able to hold several conferences and to plan the general organization of the work. They then held a conference of those persons present at the meeting whom they had been able to secure as chapter editors. Since then editors have been secured for all the proposed chapters except possibly two, which relate to fields in which few Americans have specialized. Tentative lists of titles to be included have been prepared for all the proposed chapters, about 30 in number. These lists have been carefully canvassed and criticized by the committee in two sessions, one held in New York in May and one in Middletown, Conn., in November. The members of the committee have divided the chapters among themselves for special study and have been in correspondence with the chapter editors concerning their respective lists in the light of the committee criticisms and suggestions.

The attached memoranda which have been sent to the chapter editors indicate in some detail the plans worked out by the committee. Unfortunately progress has, for many reasons, been much slower than we had hoped, but it is the purpose of the committee to prosecute the work with all possible diligence. The delay may not prove unfortunate if it shall permit publication under more advantageous conditions as regards costs.

The committee purposes to meet in Washington and to utilize all possible time during the sessions of the American Historical Association. It has arranged with the program committee for a breakfast conference with the chapter editors and all others interested on Wednesday morning, December 29.

The question of publication has been taken up with Mr. F. S. Crofts, representing Harper & Bros., who were the publishers of Dr. C. K. Adams's Manual of Historical Literature, of which they still hold copyright. Mr. Crofts has assured the committee of the desire of Harper & Bros. to publish the proposed manual and to arrange the most favorable terms practicable.

The work of the preparation of this manual involves a very large amount of correspondence and will necessarily require frequent meetings of the committee. The expenses of the members in attending the two meetings held in New York and Middletown were as follows:

	Railroad fares	Pullman	Hotel	Meals
Professor Fay:				
New York	$9.80	$3.20	.....	$1.40
Middletown	6.50	.....	.....	.....
Professor Shipman:				
New York	5.12	.....	$2.50	1.40
Middletown	9.62	.....	2.50	2.60
Doctor Shearer:				
New York	13.99	.....	3.00	2.96
Middletown	34.78	8.10	.....	2.00
Professor Dutcher:				
New York	6.40	.....	2.00	2.00
Middletown	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	86.21	11.30	10.00	12.36

In addition, there is due to Wesleyan University for—

Stenographic service	$30
Multigraphing	6
Stationery	9
Postage	5
Total	50

No exact account has been kept of the cost of these items, but the figures given are considerably inside the actual expenditures, and the amount was agreed upon with the Wesleyan authorities as satisfactory.

These total costs, then, at a minimum figure, represent a considerable excess over the grant of $75 which, it is understood, was placed at the disposal of this committee for the current year, and which has not yet been drawn upon. Ultimately, these expenditures should be reimbursed from the profit on the publication, and appropriations for the committee at the present time should be considered merely as advances and not as absolute grants. If the work is to be carried forward during the coming year, the cost will be considerably greater than during the past year.

The abolition of the former committee on bibliography of the association and the creation of the present committee on the Manual of Historical Literature has resulted in leaving at least one enterprise of a bibliographical character, prosecuted under the direction of the association, uncompleted, and provision should be made by the association for the appointment of a separate committee to take up this enterprise and carry it to completion. The task is the preparation of a bibliography of American travel. The large mass of materials thus far accumulated is at present in the hands of Doctor Shearer.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE M. DUTCHER, *Chairman.*

MANUAL OF HISTORICAL LITERATURE

C. K. Adams's Manual.—At the suggestion of the American Library Association, the American Historical Association has appointed a committee to replace the Manual of Historical Literature prepared by Charles Kendall Adams and published in 1882 by Harpers (third edition in 1888). The work of Adams was divided into 13 chapters, besides the introduction, and contained criticisms varying in length from 100 to 300 words on about 970 titles. In addition, there were appended to each chapter a few pages of suggestions to students and readers, in which courses of reading were outlined with a considerable number of additional titles mentioned, sometimes with a few words of comment.

Purpose of the new manual.—The public to which this book will be addressed will include primarily public libraries and high schools and academies with their teachers of history. The book is to be prepared by experts in a thoroughly scholarly manner, but intended for distinctly popular use. The selection of titles and the character of the comments will, in considerable measure, be determined by the nature of the public addressed. The volume will also have its value for the scholar who wishes guidance in fields other than his own.

As the volume will serve for guidance to public libraries in their purchase of works in history, an arrangement will be made to suggest selected lists for libraries adapted to their size and resources. Assuming that the large libraries will have or purchase nearly all the works reviewed, about 40 to 50 per cent of the titles will be marked by an asterisk as desirable for libraries of moderate size, and about 20 to 25 per cent of the titles will be marked by a double asterisk as desirable for the smaller libraries.

Content of new manuals.—Owing to the lapse of time since the final edition of Adams's work it is practically necessary to abandon his list of titles and to prepare an entirely new list. Further, the events of the past half century and the expansion of historical activities have made necessary chapters on numerous topics not included by Adams. The committee proposes a list of 26 chapters dealing with from 25 to 100 titles each, in accordance with the importance of the subject concerned, giving a total of about 1,300 titles. In large measure, the selection will be made from works now on the market or generally available. These titles are to be entirely of publications in English which have appeared within the last 50 years (1870–1920, inclusive) or have appeared in English translation or in a new edition within that period. To these there will be devoted comments varying from 100 to 300 words with a preference for the shorter comments, the longer comments being usually reserved for those books whose contents require some detailed outline because the title is not sufficiently indicative thereof.

Each chapter will usually include, in addition to this major list, a list of a few titles of standard English works which have not been reprinted within the last 50 years and also of outstanding works in French and German. To titles in these classes comments of from 20 to 50 words will be appended. In the case of a few chapters relating to specific countries which are represented in the American population by a considerable body of immigrants, a few titles of books in the language of the country will be added with similar brief comments.

To each chapter there will be added a somewhat brief section of suggestions to students and readers, which shall refer primarily to the titles included in the chapters rather than being devoted to outlining detailed courses of reading or citing additional titles. The tentative list of chapters, chapter editors, and apportionment of titles is included herewith.

Method of preparation.—Each chapter will be assigned to an expert in the field concerned, who will act as chapter editor. He will assume primary responsibility for selecting the titles which will be submitted to a selected list of librarians and other scholars in the field, for criticism, and additional suggestions, on the basis of which the chapter editor will prepare his final list. The chapter editor will then distribute the titles of works in his chapter among a considerable group of other scholars to prepare the comments, which will be revised and harmonized by the chapter editor. The chapter editor will also be expected to prepare the section on suggestions to readers and students. The arrangement of titles under each chapter should probably be by a partially chronological order under subheadings, the French and German and older English works being interspersed in their proper order among the English of recent date to which the major comments are given.

The work as a whole will be under the direction of a committee of the American Historical Association, which will pass finally upon the lists to be included in the several chapters and will edit the work as a whole. It is desired that the chapter editors submit to the committee their preliminary list not later than February 15, 1920, so that the list may be circulated for criticism and suggestions and then revised by the chapter editor in time for consideration and revision by the committee at a meeting to be held about March 10, 1920, in order that they may approve the list and adjust any overlapping. The chapter editors are requested to furnish the committee, prior to that date, a list of scholars who may be asked to prepare the criticisms of some of the works included in their respective chapters. It is desired that the criticisms of the volumes shall all be in the hands of the chapter editors as early in the summer as practicable, certainly not later than July 15, so that the chapter editors may complete their work and submit it to the committee not later than September 1. The committee may thus be able to arrange for the completion of the editorial work before the close of the calendar year.

Geography.—A very few titles of works of a geographical and descriptive sort should be included in each chapter. These should be general in scope rather than related to a special section or topic. Perhaps these titles would best be incorporated in the suggestions to the reader.

Bibliography.—Each chapter shall include, perhaps in the suggestions to the reader, reference to the most important general bibliographies relating to its subject. In connection with each title mention will be made of special critical bibliographies, if they are contained in the work. The Library of Congress card number will be printed following each title, which shall be given in the form used on the Library of Congress cards.

Articles in periodicals.—As public libraries usually have only a limited number of sets of periodicals, and as the size of the work must be limited, articles in periodicals will not normally be included in the list of titles, save in exceptional cases where there is an important article in a generally accessible periodical covering a subject not adequately handled in an available book. The suggestions to readers and students will sometimes include references to periodicals and periodical articles. Book reviews of unusual value will occasionally be mentioned in connection with the titles to which they relate, but this practice must necessarily be limited by the small number of files of reviewing periodicals in public libraries.

Compensation.—There are no funds available to compensate anyone for any work in preparing this volume, except that the American Historical Association has placed $75 at the disposal of the committee to cover necessary traveling expenses to committee meetings and to cover postage, multigraphing, etc. On the other hand, the volume ought to yield a considerable royalty, and it is suggested that the royalty be paid in such proportions as may be agreed on, to the American Library Association (which it is hoped will forego any claim), and to the American Historical Association. It is suggested that such money as shall thus come to the American Historical Association shall become a permanent fund known as the Charles Kendall Adams fund for historical bibliography, whose income shall be used alone for the promotion of the preparation and publication of works of historical bibliograghy.

The committee will welcome criticisms and suggestions on any matter connected with the work and the details of the plan. The committee also solicits the judgment of the chapter editors on the following problems:

I. Shall the comments be signed with the initials or names of the writers? In my judgment the initials should be used and the names of the coworkers in each chapter should follow that of the chapter editor at the head of the chapter, it being understood that the chapter editor shall feel free to suggest modifications of comments to the original writer where he regards the nature of the comments as distinctly contrary to his own views or as essentially incorrect. It should be understood that the real responsibility for the criticism will rest upon the person whose initials are appended thereto, while the chapter editor assumes responsibility for the general character of the chapter, particularly with reference to the selection of titles and the suggestions to the student and reader. Another possibility is to include the list of names of coworkers at the head of the chapter as I have indicated and to leave all the comments unsigned. This would leave a sort of distributed responsibility and would perhaps leave the chapter editor a certain amount of discretion and freedom in revising the comments of any particular writer on any particular title. In this case the chapter editor would clearly assume a larger responsibility for the character of the comments on all titles in his chapter. This question is obviously of considerable importance.

II. Ought there to be a chapter of introduction more or less similar to that of Adams's, perhaps reprinting sections of that chapter, or should an introduction of an entirely different character be prepared? If there is to be an introduction, who should be asked to write it?

George M. Dutcher, *Chairman,*
Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
Sidney B. Fay,
Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
Augustus H. Shearer,
Grosvener Library, Buffalo, N. Y.
Henry R. Shipman,
Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
Committee of the American Historical Association.

GENERAL SCHEME OF CHAPTERS

About 1,300 titles (Adams had 970) plus "suggested titles" and cross references.

Chapter	Editor	Titles
General history	C. H. Hull	50
History and auxiliary sciences	G. L. Burr	50
Ancient history	Olmstead	30
Greece	Westerman	40
Rome	Boak	40
Medieval	Paetow	60
Modern—1500 to 1870	Lingelbach	75
Last 50 years	F. M. Anderson	80
Colonial expansion of Europe to 1815	W. C. Abbott	40
Since 1815	Coolidge	50
England	Cross	100
France	Bourne	100
Spain and Portugal	Merriman	30
Italy	T. F. Jones	50
Germany	Fay	100
Netherlands and Belgium	Jameson	25
Scandinavia	Larsen	25
Russia and Poland	Lord	50
Southeastern Europe	Kerner	40
Ottoman Empire	Lybyer	30
India and Middle East	Dennis	30
Far East	Treat	40
Oceania	Blakeslee	25
Africa	Beer	60
United States	To be arranged	
Latin America	Cox	50
Canada	Wrong	30

To the Chapter Editors:

At a meeting of the committee held recently in Middletown it was decided, in order to advance the work, to apportion the chapters among the four members of the committee for special study and for correspondence with the chapter editors and others as might be desirable, particularily in the next few weeks.

It was decided to arrange for a breakfast conference at the American Historical Association meeting in Washington, at 8 a. m., December 29, in the New Ebbitt House. It is hoped that the chapter editors will, as far as possible, plan to attend this conference.

In the study of the lists of titles submitted for the several chapters it has been found necessary to adhere rigidly to the policy of assigning each book to only one chapter and that the chapter to which it most clearly and logically belonged. It was, however, decided that some system of cross reference should later on be arranged.

With regard to the arrangement of titles within the chapters the following policy was approved: (1) Bibliography. (2) Geography and ethnography. (3) General books. (4) Books on periods. (5) Books on special topics.

Under these several headings briefs of books or outlines should be placed first and the major works last. In other cases where this policy does not serve, a chronological arrangement should be followed, as in the subdivision on periods.

Books published prior to 1870 and books in foreign languages should be incorporated at their proper place in the main lists. Their number, however, should be kept as low as reasonably possible, and it is to be understood that any notations on these titles shall usually be kept under 50 words. It is probable that these titles and annotations will be printed in a smaller type than the titles in the main English list.

Where two or more books by the same author are cited in the same chapter they should be treated as one number and given a review together unless such procedure should be quite incongruous. This practice will save space and permit the insertion of a larger number of titles.

In case brief outlines or textbooks are listed, it will be wise, as a rule, to select the one preferred for chief mention and review and then to give just passing men-

tion under the first title to so many additional titles as might be desirable. Thus in English history, after citing as the main title Cross, reference could be made in the briefest fashion to Tout, Cheyney, Wrong, Gardiner, etc.

In order that the list of reviewers may be completed and approved by the committee at the meeting in Washington, will you please, at your earliest convenience, send in a list of names of persons you would suggest to cooperate with us in reviewing books in your chapter? If you know of persons whom you would especially recommend to assist in any other chapters, such suggestions will also be appreciated by the committee.

NOVEMBER 23, 1920.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON A PRIMER OF ARCHIVES

Mr. Leland and I have found it impossible, notwithstanding our best intentions and correspondence, to meet together during the year for the purpose of working out an apportionment of the primer, and we are able to report at this time that we shall hope to be able to do better next year, if no unexpected illness or other mishaps interpose themselves. Personally, I have given so much time as chairman of the nominating committee this year that I could give no more to the committee on the primer.

Respectfully submitted.

VICTOR H. PALTSITS, *Chairman.*

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS

Article VII of the constitution provides that: "This constitution may be amended at any annual meeting, notice of such amendment having been given at the previous annual meeting *or the proposed amendment having received the approval of the executive council.*" A majority of the members of the present nominating committee, namely, Miss Ellery, and Messrs. Fish, Hamilton, and Paltsits, strongly recommend to the executive council approval before the forthcoming annual meeting of the association of an amendment of Article II of the by-laws, as marked on the exhibit herewith; that is, to change error in the second word, so as to read "nominating" for "nomination"; to omit the words in brackets, namely, the referendum feature beginning with "at such convenient time" and ending with "then to be chosen"; and allowing two days instead of only one before the annual business meeting for the printing of additional nominations as provided otherwise by the by-law in question.

Mr. Hodder seemed disinclined to join the rest of us in our strong appeal for the elimination of the unworkable and costly referendum, which does not at all bring about the results it was supposed would come from it. It has proven itself a fiasco. I have elaborate data, which I am ready to submit to the executive council on behalf of the nominating committee, as information concerning the absurdities of the whole matter. Mr. Hodder found himself hampered by university work at the time when my elaborate analysis was sent to him, as well as to the rest of the committee members. His reply to me as chairman came only after a second request, and I judged from what he wrote that he had not read the entire docket carefully. I have since asked him to submit a minority report. He has not done so; therefore I am not able to know whether he still holds his former judgment or whether a careful reading of the docket has convinced him, as it has the rest of us, that an immediate abrogation of the useless referendum feature is for the best interests of the American Historical Association and its members. The letters from Professors Ellery, Fish, and Hamilton, giving expression of their wishes through me as chairman, are on file and are the command of the executive council, together with everything else that the executive council may wish from the nominating committee as to the duties performed by the said committee in carrying out its trust.

Respectfully submitted.

VICTOR H. PALTSITS, *Chairman.*

Final Report of the Chairman of the Committee on the London Headquarters of the Association

Upon recommendation of the committee, it was voted by the executive council on December 27, 1919, that notice should be given of the termination of the agreement of our association with the Royal Historical Society whereby our association has possessed a room in the building of the Royal Historical Society as a subtenant under that organization; that the treasurer of our association should make such payments to the Royal Historical Society as would be required to meet our legal obligations; that the furniture of the room should be disposed of by giving to the American University Union whatever articles it could use and by selling the rest; that the books should be given to the library of the American University Union; and that messages of thanks should be sent to those who have acted as officers of our London Branch.

These votes were immediately acted upon by the chairman of the committee. On January 2, 1920, Mr. H. P. Biggar, honorary treasurer of the London branch, was notified of the action of the council. After consultation with the officers of the Royal Historical Society termination of the lease was effected on the next quarter day, March 25. The books and all the furniture, excepting the carpets and the fire implements, were turned over in January to the American University Union. Later, Mr. Biggar reported that the Royal Historical Society had bought the fixtures remaining in the rooms. On July 16 Mr. Biggar was instructed to buy from the Macmillan Co. in London copies of any numbers of the American Historical Review which were lacking from the set kept in the library of the Royal Historical Society and to hold for the present whatever balance of the funds of the association remained in his hands.

His final report, filed herewith, indicates a balance remaining in his hands on October 31, 1920, of £4 12s. This sum was paid into the treasury of the association on December 22, being reckoned at $16.27. The directions of the council have now been all carried out and the history of the London branch may be regarded as ended. The committee would wish to be discharged.

Respectfully submitted for the committee.

J. F. Jameson, *Chairman.*

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EXECTIVE COUNCIL HELD AT 1140 WOODWARD BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C., DECEMBER 27, 1920

The council met at 10.30 a. m. Present: President Channing, presiding; Messrs. Bourne, Burr, Haskins, Jameson, Jusserand, Lingelbach, McMaster, Moore, Miss Putnam, and the secretary. There also attended Mr. Allen R. Boyd, editor; Miss P. W. Washington, assistant secretary-treasurer; Mr. H. B. Learned, chairman of the committee on publicatons; and Mr. Joseph Schafer, chairman of the committee on history and education for citizenship in the schools.

The secretary presented his report, which showed a total membership of 2,524, as against 2,445 a year ago. The number whose dues were paid on December 15, 1920, was reported as 2,074, as against 2,032 on December 18, 1919. The net gain in membership was 79, this being the first year since 1915 in which the membership has shown a net gain.

The secretary reported that the will of the late James Schouler, of Intervale, N. H., former president of the association contained a bequest to the association in the following terms:

To the American Historical Association I give and bequeath the framed oil portrait of myself (a replica by Corner) which now hangs in the parlor of my house at Intervale; the same to be used, loaned, given away, or sold, at the discretion of the council of said association.

The council voted to authorize the secretary to lend the portrait of Mr. Schouler to the United States National Museum.

The secretary reported that the will of the late George Louis Beer contained a bequest to the association in the following terms:

I give, devise, and bequeath to the American Historical Association of Washington, D. C., a corporation duly incorporated and existing by act of Congress, January 4, 1889, the sum of five thousand dollars ($5,000.00), to be held by said corporation as a special fund in trust for the following purposes only: The said sum of $5,000.00 is to be invested by the officials of the said American Historical Association and the net income thereof is to be paid annually to a citizen of the United States who submits "the best work upon any phase of European international history since the year 1895"; the award to be made each year and the judges to be selected in accordance with the rules and regulations adopted by the said American Historical Association.

The council voted to authorize the creation of a prize to be awarded in accordance with the terms of Mr. Beer's bequest and to be known as the "George L. Beer prize."

The council voted to appoint a special committee to prepare rules for the award of the George L. Beer prize.

It was voted to instruct the secretary to secure the preparation of memorials of the late James Schouler and George L. Beer to be spread upon the records of the association.

The special committee, consisting of the president, secretary, and treasurer, which had been authorized to investigate the activities of certain so-called historical societies and to take the appropriate legal action as might be deemed advisable, reported that, while the activities of these societies were clearly shown to be of a commercial character, of no historical value, and in some instances of doubtful legality, it was, in the opinion of the committee, inexpedient for the association to initiate legal action against the organizations. It was voted to accept the committee's report and to discharge the committee. The secretary reported that the Peoples of America Society had requested the association to appoint two representatives to cooperate with that society for the study of racial elements in the United States.

The council voted that the delegates be appointed.

Upon motion by the secretary it was voted to appoint a committee on the writing of history for the purpose of studying the general question of history writing and of reporting on the appropriate means to be adopted for its stimulation and improvement.

Mr. Jameson reported for the committee on London headquarters that, in accordance with the vote of the council on December 27, 1919, the rooms occupied by the association in London had been vacated and an unexpended balance of $16.27 had been turned into the treasury.

It was voted to discharge the committee.

The report of the board of editors of the American Historical Review was presented by the secretary.

It was voted to accept it.

The secretary reported that no report had been received from the board of editors of the Historical Outlook.

The secretary presented the report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission.

It was voted to accept it.

The secretary reported that the committee on the Justin Winsor prize reported its inability to agree upon the award. It was voted that the essays of Messrs. Cunninghan, Benns, and Wood be submitted to the Justin Winsor prize committee for 1921 with the request that the committee make the award as early as possible.

Mr. Learned reported for the committee on publications. It was voted to give the committee full power to dispose of the stock of prize essays and to make arrangements

for the publication of Mr. Nussbaum's essay on "G. J. A. Ducher: An Essay on Commercial Policy in the French Revolution," to which was awarded the Adams prize of 1917.

Mr. Leland appeared before the council to report for the committee on the disposition of the records of the association. It was voted to authorize the committee to destroy such records of purely routine character as were in its judgment possessed of no value to the association and to deposit with the Library of Congress such records as were selected for preservation and should be deemed of no further use in the transaction of the business of the association.

The secretary presented the report from the committee on the historical congress at Rio de Janeiro, which it was voted to accept.

A statement from the committee on the military history prize was presented to the effect that eight essays had been submitted but that the award had not yet been made. It was voted to give the committee an extension of time and to instruct it to report its award to the secretary as soon as it should be made.

The report of the treasurer was read and accepted.

The report of the committee on history and education for citizenship in the schools, together with its request to be discharged, was presented by the secretary. After discussion it was voted to defer action in the matter and to request Mr. Bourne to attend the conference of the committee on December 29 and to report to the council such recommendations as may seem to him appropriate.

The council adjourned to meet at 2 p. m.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The council met at 2 p. m. Present: President Channing, presiding; Messrs. Bolton, Bourne, Burr, Haskins, Jameson, Lingelbach, Moore, Miss Putnam, and the secretary. There also attended Mr. Allen R. Boyd, editor; Miss P. W. Washington, assistant secretary-treasurer; Mr. George M. Dutcher, chairman of the committee on a manual of historical literature; and Mr. T. J. Wertenbaker, chairman of the committee on membership.

It was voted to recommend to the association that the next meeting be held at St. Louis in acceptance of invitations extended by Washington university, the Governor of Missouri, and the mayor of St. Louis.

The report of the committee on membership was presented by its chairman, Mr. Wertenbaker. It was voted to accept the report and to authorize the chairman to enlarge the committee by appointing associate members.

The report of the committee on a bibliography of modern English history was presented by the secretary. It was voted to accept the report and to refer the committee's request for an appropiation of $150 for 1921 to the committee on finance.

The report of the committee on a manual of historical literature was read by the secretary. It was voted to accept the report, except for the proposal that the major list should be composed exclusively of books printed in English, and to refer the matter of an appropriation for the committee to the committee on finance.

The secretary presented the report of the chairman of the conference of historical societies. The report was accepted.

The council then proceeded to consider the report of the committee on policy as presented by its chairman, Mr. C. H. Haskins. The report was read in full and was then considered section by section, action being taken as follows:

Section 21.—It was voted that, "pending the consideration of an amendment of the constitution raising the annual fees from $3 to $5, members are invited to make special contributions of from $2 to $5 in addition to the present dues."

Section 1.—It was voted that of the program committee three members shall serve three-year terms, so arranged that one member retires each year, the other members to have one-year terms and be selected with reference to locality.

Section 2.—It was voted that scholarly summaries or abstracts of all papers read at the meetings and not printed in the Review shall appear in the annual reports of the association.

Section 3.—It was voted to approve the recommendations of the committee on policy respecting the historical manuscripts commission.

Section 4.—It was voted to continue the public archives commission and to charge it with the preparation of the primer of archive economy, now assigned to a special committee.

Section 5.—It was voted to continue the present standing committee on the national archives.

Section 6.—It was voted to establish a committee on securing transcripts in foreign archives.

Section 7.—It was voted to reestablish a committee on the documentary historical publications of the United States Government.

Section 8.—It was voted to continue the standing committee on bibliography, to charge it with completing and publishing the bibliography of American travel, with continuing, in cooperation with the American Library Association, the compilation of the Manual of Historical Literature, and with the consideration of the other bibliographical projects (except the bibliography of modern English history) enumerated in section 8 of the report of the committee on policy.

Section 9.—It was voted to request the editor to report on some dependable means for carrying on the publication of Writings on American History without incurring a deficit. It was the opinion of the council that Writings should be published in the annual report until it can be brought out separately.

Section 10.—It was voted to comply with the request of the present committee on history and education for citizenship in the schools for the discharge of the said committee, and that the president, the two vice presidents, and the secretary be empowered to appoint a committee on history teaching in the schools.

Section 12.—It was voted to reconstitute a committee on hereditary patriotic societies.

Section 13.—It was voted to appoint a standing committee on military history whose chief function should be to advise and cooperate with the Historical Branch of the General Staff and with other governmental agencies, national and State, which are engaged in preparing histories of the war.

The council adjourned at 5.30 p. m. to meet at the New Willard Hotel on December 28 at 9 a. m.

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL HELD AT THE NEW WILLARD HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., ON DECEMBER 28, 1920

The council met at 9 a. m. Present: President Channing, presiding; Messrs. Bolton, Bourne, Burr, Haskins, Jameson, Lingelbach, Moore, Miss Putnam, and the secretary. There also attended Mr. Allen R. Boyd, editor, and Miss P. W. Washington, assistant secretary-treasurer.

The council continued its consideration of the report of the committee on policy.

Section 15.—It was voted that the proposal for establishing a series of historical studies be approved in principle and that the matter be referred for further report to the committee (D. C. Munro, chairman) which was appointed by the informal conference on the establishment of a journal of European history held at Cincinnati during the annual meetings of the American Historical Association in December, 1916.

Section 16.—It was voted to approve the recommendation of the committee respecting the Robert M. Johnston prize and the George Louis Beer prize.

Section 17.—It was voted to authorize the payment from the treasury of the association of traveling expenses of the association's delegates to the meetings of the American Council of Learned Societies.

Section 18.—It was voted to approve the plan for a university center for higher studies in Washington and to appoint representatives to confer with the representatives of other organizations interested in the enterprise.

Section 19.—It was voted to change the name of the committee on docket to committee on agenda, and that the two vice presidents, the secretary, and the treasurer should be ex officio members of the committee. It was voted to authorize the payment from the treasury of the association of the traveling expenses incurred by the members of the committee on agenda in attending one meeting of the committee each year.

Section 20.—It was voted to establish a standing committee on service.

It was voted to adopt the report of the committee on policy as a whole, subject to the changes involved in the votes of the council relating thereto and to present it to the association with the recommendation that it be adopted.

The council then proceeded to consider the recommendations of the committee on appointments with respect to committee assignments. It was voted to make the following appointments:

Standing Committees

(Names of new members are printed in italics

Committee on program for the thirty-sixth annual meeting.—*Evarts B. Greene*, chairman (appointed for one year); *Charles Seymour* (appointed for two years), *Walter L. Fleming* (appointed for three years), *Thomas M. Marshall, Norman M. Trenholme;* and ex officiis, N. A. Olsen, secretary of the Agricultural History Society, John C. Parish, secretary of the conference of historical societies.

Historical manuscripts commission.—Justin H. Smith, chairman; *Annie H. Abel*, Eugene C. Barker, *Robert P. Brooks*, Logan Esarey, Gaillard Hunt.

Committee on the Justin Winsor prize.—*Clive Day*, chairman; *Isaac J. Cox, Thomas F. Moran, Bernard C. Steiner, William W. Sweet.*

Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize.—Conyers Read, chairman; Charles H. McIlwain, *David S. Muzzey*, Nellie Neilson, Bernadotte E. Schmitt, *Wilbur H. Siebert.*

Committee on publications.—H. Barrett Learned, chairman; and, ex officiis, John S. Bassett, Allen R. Boyd, J. Franklin Jameson, Justin H. Smith, R. H. True.

Committee on membership.—Thomas J. Wertenbaker, chairman; Louise Fargo Brown, Eugene H. Byrne, A. C. Krey, Frank E. Melvin, Richard A. Newhall, Charles W. Ramsdell, Arthur P. Scott, J. J. Van Nostrand, jr., *James E. Winston*, George F. Zook.

Conference of historical societies.—John C. Parish, secretary (chairman to be elected by the conference).

Committee on national archives.—J. Franklin Jameson, chairman; Charles Moore, Col. Oliver L. Spaulding, jr.

Committee on bibliography.—George M. Dutcher, chairman; Sidney B. Fay, Augustus H. Shearer, Henry R. Shipman, (it was voted to authorize the chairman in consultation with the secretary of the association to appoint additional members).

Public archives commission.—Victor H. Paltsits, chairman; *Solon J. Buck, R. D. W. Connor, Waldo G. Leland, Arnold J. F. van Laer.*

Committee on obtaining transcripts from foreign archives.—*J. Franklin Jameson*, chairman; *Charles M. Andrews, Waldo G. Leland.*

Committee on military history.—*Brig. Gen. Eben Swift*, chairman; *Allen R. Boyd, R. B. House, Capt. Eben Putnam, Col. Oliver L. Spaulding, jr.*

Committee on hereditary patriotic societies.—(It was voted that this committee should be appointed by a special committee consisting of the secretary, the treasurer, and Mr. Leland.)

Committee on service.—*J. Franklin Jameson*, chairman. (It was agreed that the other members of the committee should be appointed by the secretary of the association and the chairman of the committee in consultation.)

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Committee on bibliography of modern English history.—Edward P. Cheyney, chairman; *Arthur L. Cross, Roger B. Merriman, Wallace Notestein, Conyers Read.*

Committee on the historical congress at Rio de Janeiro.—Bernard Moses, honorary chairman; Percy A. Martin, acting chairman; Julius Klein, secretary; Charles Lyon Chandler, Charles H. Cunningham, *Constantine E. McGuire, Ambassador Edwin V. Morgan, Manoel de Oliveira Lima, W. L. Schurz.*

Committee on the documentary historical publications of the United States Government.—*J. Franklin Jameson*, chairman; *Henry Cabot Lodge, Charles Moore.* (It was voted to authorize the committee to add to its numbers.)

Committee to formulate rules for the George L. Beer prize.—*William A. Dunning*, chairman; *Marshall S. Brown, Edwin S. Corwin.*

Committee on the writing of history.—*Ambassador Jean Jules Jusserand*, chairman; *Wilbur C. Abbott, Charles W. Colby.*

Upon nomination by the committee on appointments the council elected Mr. G. S. Ford a member of the board of editors of the American Historical Review for the full term of six years ending in December, 1926.

Upon nomination by the committee on appointments the following were elected a board of editors of the Historical Outlook to advise with the managing editor: Edgar Dawson, Laurence M. Larson, William L. Westermann, Sarah A. Dynes, and Daniel C. Knowlton.

The council adjourned to meet at 1140 Woodward Building on December 29 at 9.30 a. m.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL HELD AT 1140 WOODWARD BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C., ON DECEMBER 29, 1920.

The council met at 9.30 a. m. Present: President Channing, presiding; Messrs. Bolton, Burr, Haskins, Jameson, Lingelbach, Moore, Miss Putnam, and the secretary. There also attended Mr. Allen R. Boyd, editor, and Miss P. W. Washington, assistant secretary-treasurer.

Mr. Dana C. Munro and Mr. Waldo G. Leland were appointed a committee to confer with representatives of other associations on the organization of a university center for higher studies in Washington.

Mr. Allen R. Boyd reported that the committee on the military history prize had awarded the Robert M. Johnston prize to Mr. Thomas Robson Hay for his essay, "Hood's Tennessee campaign," with honorable mention to Mr. W. P. Webb for his essay "The Texas Rangers in the Mexican War," and to Maj. J. N. Greely for his essay, "What happens in battle."

The treasurer presented the report of the finance committee on the budget for 1921. It was voted to accept the report and to approve for adoption by the association the following budget:

APPROPRIATIONS

Secretary and treasurer	$3,000
Pacific Coast Branch	50
Nominating committee	100
Committee on membership	100
Committee on program	300
Committee on local arrangements	50
Conference of historical societies	25
Committee on publications	700

Council committee on agenda	$300
American Historical Review	7,000
Historical manuscripts commission	20
Justin Winsor prize	200
Writings on American History	200
American Council of Learned Societies	150
Committee on bibliography	250
Committee on the writing of history	75
Total	12,520

ESTIMATED INCOME

Annual dues	7,000
Registration fees	150
Publications	100
Royalties	50
Interest	1,400
Miscellaneous	50
Total	8,750

The committee on history and education for citizenship in the schools submitted, in addition to the report previously presented, the following resolution:

Resolved, That the committee ask the council for permission to publish its final report, to embody: (1) A fairly definite outline of the reorganized program for the 12 years as embodied in the June, 1919, issue of the Historical Outlook; (2) a straightforward statement justifying the program; (3) syllabi of certain selected topics and courses embodied in the program which will be put forth not as final recommendations but merely as suggestive of the detailed treatment that might be accorded to the various parts of the program.

After consideration of the request by the committee on history and education for citizenship in the schools the council voted to adopt the following statement:

In discharging the committee at its own request, the council desires to record its high appreciation of its laborious services. In view of the incomplete nature of the report and of the fact that a considerable difference of opinion seems to exist among the members of the association respecting the recommendations of the committee on history and education for citizenship in the schools, the council is apprehensive that formal publication of the report by the committee would appear to commit the association prematurely, and therefore the council thinks it wise to refer the whole subject to the new standing committee on history teaching in the school.

It was voted to authorize the treasurer to pay from the appropriation of the committee on history and education for citizenship in the schools for 1920 the sum of $300 to Miss Frances Morehouse for services rendered to the committee.

The secretary reported a request that was made to him informally by Mr. George Grafton Wilson for the appointment of a committee to cooperate with the historical section of the Navy Department. It was voted to authorize the committee on service to appoint a committee of three to cooperate with the Historical Section of the Navy Department in such manner as may be desired by the chief of the section. It was also voted to authorize the committee on service to meet similar requests in a similar way.

It was voted to authorize the committee on appointments to appoint two representatives of the association to cooperate with the Peoples of America Society in accordance with the previous vote of the council.

The council adjourned to meet at 1140 Woodward Building on December 30 at 9.30 a. m.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL HELD AT 1140 WOODWARD BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C., ON DECEMBER 30, 1920

The council met at 9.45 a. m. Present: First Vice President Haskins, presiding, Messrs. Bourne, Burr, Cheyney, Cross, Fay, Hayes, Jameson, Moore, Sioussat, Miss Putnam, and the secretary. There also attended Mr. Allen R. Boyd, editor, and Miss P. W. Washington, assistant secretary-treasurer.

Mr. Bourne reported that, in compliance with the request of the council, he had attended the conference on the report of the committee on history and education for citizenship in the schools. After discussion it was found to be the sense of the council that the request of the committee respecting the publication of its report should be disposed of in accordance with the statement adopted by the council in the session of December 29.

It was voted to request Mr. Robert S. Brookings, of St. Louis, to serve as chairman of the committee on local arrangements for the St. Louis meeting.

Mr. Archibald C. Coolidge was elected a member of the board of editors of the American Historical Review for the unexpired term of Mr. E. P. Cheyney, who resigned from the board following his election as second vice president of the association.

It was voted that the committee on agenda consist of the president, the vice presidents, the secretary, the treasurer, and four other members of the council to be designated.

Mr. Daniel C. Knowlton was elected a member of the board of editors of the Historical Outlook in place of Mr. Sioussat, who resigned following his election to the executive council.

It was voted to establish a committee of five on endowment. The treasurer was appointed chairman of the committee with authority to appoint the other members in consultation with the secretary.

It was voted that the secretary and treasurer, in consultation with the committee on bibliography, be authorized to make arrangements for the publication of the Manual of Historical Literature.

It was voted that the secretary, with such consultation as he may desire, be authorized to make appointments for 1921 to the ordinary standing committees of the council.

It was voted to suggest to the committee on local arrangements for the St. Louis meeting that the sessions commence on Wednesday, December 28, and last three days.

Mr. Waldo G. Leland was appointed a committee of one to confer with representatives of other learned societies in order to obtain reduced railroad rates for the annual meetings of these societies.

The secretary was instructed to extend the thanks of the council to the committee on local arrangements for the Washington meeting, to the Librarian of Congress, to the Women's City Club, and to the Association of Collegiate Alumnæ for services, courtesies, and hospitalities in connection with the present meetings of the association. The secretary was authorized to write a letter to the Secretary of War in appreciation of his address at the dinner on December 29.

The council adjourned.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ADOPTED BY CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE MEMBERS

Appointments to Committees of the Council

Committee on Agenda.—Charles H. Haskins (ex officio), chairman; John S. Bassett (ex officio), Edward P. Cheyney (ex officio), Arthur L. Cross, Sidney B. Fay, Carlton J. H. Hayes, Jean Jules Jusserand, Charles Moore (ex officio), Frederic L. Paxson.

Committee on meetings and relations.—John S. Bassett, chairman; Edward Channing, Carl Russell Fish, Ruth Putnam, James T. Shotwell.

Committee on finance.—Charles Moore, chairman; John S. Bassett, Sidney B. Fay, Frederic L. Paxson, St. George L. Sioussat.

Committee on appointments.—Jean Jules Jusserand, chairman; John S. Bassett, Edward P. Cheyney, Carl Russell Fish, Carlton J. H. Hayes.

Appointments to Standing Committees of the Association

Committee on history teaching in the schools.—Henry Johnson, chairman; Henry E. Bourne, Philip P. Chase, Guy Stanton Ford, Daniel C. Knowlton, Albert E. McKinley, Eugene M. Violette.

Committee on service.—J. Franklin Jameson, chairman; Elbert J. Benton, Clarence S. Brigham, Worthington C. Ford, Arthur C. Howland, Albert E. McKinley, James Sullivan.

Committee on membership, associate members (appointed by the chairman).—Milledge L. Bonham, jr., Henry E. Bourne, Julian P. Bretz, Robert P. Brooks, Sarah A. Dynes, Austin P. Evans, J. Montgomery Gambrill, Sheldon J. Howe, M. Berna Hunt, Laurence M. Larson, John H. Logan, Margaret J. Mitchell, Laurence B. Packard, George Petrie, Walter Prichard, Charles H. Rammelkamp, Morgan P. Robinson, Louis M. Sears, Augustus H. Shearer, Earl E. Sperry, David Y. Thomas, Frederic L. Thompson, Norman M. Trenholme, James A. Woodburn, Jesse E. Wrench, John P. Wynne.

Committee on hereditary patriotic societies.—Dixon R. Fox, chairman; Natalie S. Lincoln, Harry Brent Mackoy, Mrs. Annie L. Sioussat, R. C. Ballard Thurston.

Committee on local arrangements for thirty-sixth annual meeting.—William K. Bixby, chairman; Mrs. Nettie H. Beauregard, Ralph P. Bieber, Stella M. Drumm, David R. Francis, Benjamin Gratz, John H. Gundlach, Breckinridge Jones, Mrs. Robert McKittrick Jones, Breckinridge Long, Mrs. N. A. McMillan, Thomas M. Marshall, Charles P. Pettus, George R. Throop.

Committee on bibliography of American travel.—Benjamin F. Shambaugh, chairman; Solon J. Buck, M. M. Quaife.

Appointments to Special Committees of the Association

Committee to cooperate with the Peoples of America Society in the study of race elements in the United States.—John S. Bassett, chairman; Frederic L. Paxson.

Register of Attendance at the Thirty-fifth Annual Meeting at Washington, D. C.

A

Abel, Annie Heloise.
Adams, Randolph G.
Adams, Victoria A.
Allison, William H.
Ambler, Charles H.
Ames, Herman V.
Anderson, D. R.
Anderson, Frank Maloy.
Andrews, Charles M.
Andrews, George Gordon.
Appleton, William W.
Arnett, Alex Mathews.
Asakawa, K.
Atkeson, Mary Meek.

B

Baldwin, Alice M.
Baldwin, James F.
Barclay, Thomas S.
Barnes, Harry E.
Barss, Katharine G.
Bassett, John Spencer.
Becker, Carl.
Belmende, Victor Andrés.
Belote, Theodore.
Benton, E. J.
Berry, Sarah.
Best, Harry.
Betten, Rev. Francis S.
Beveridge, Albert J.
Bieber, Ralph P.
Bigelow, Col. John.
Black, J. William.
Bolton, Herbert E.
Bond, Beverley W., jr.

Boucher, Chauncey S.
Bourne, Henry E.
Bowden, Witt.
Bowden, Mrs. Witt.
Bowerman, G. F.
Boyd, William K.
Brandon, Edgar Ewing.
Brandt, Walther I.
Bridges, Samuel G.
Briggs, Elizabeth.
Brook, Elizabeth Cable.
Brown, Marshall S.
Brown, Samuel H.
Bryan, W. B.
Burk, Rev. W. Herbert.
Burr, G. L.
Butler, Dorthy.

C

Cairnes, Laura J.
Caldwell, Wallace E.
Callahan, James Morton.
Carman, Harry J.
Carpenter, William S.
Carrier, Lyman.
Carroll, E. M.
Chambers, Raymond.
Chandler, J. A. C.
Channing, Edward.
Chapman, Charles E.
Chen, Geoffrey C.
Cheyney, E. P.
Churchill, George M.
Clark, Hollis Chenery.
Clark, Victor S.
Clarkson, Jesse Dunsmore.
Clemen, Rudolph A.
Cole, Arthur C.
Cole, Mrs. E. W.
Cole, Theodore L.
Coleman, Christopher B.
Colgate, Lathrop.
Colvin, Caroline.
Conant, Isabel Fiske.
Conlan, Mrs. Michael.
Connor, R. D. W.
Coulomb, Charles A.
Coulter, E. M.
Cox, Isaac Joslin.
Creutz, Gregory M.
Crofts, F. S.
Cross, Arthur Lyon.
Crossman, L. E.
Crouse, N. M.
Curtis, Eugene Newton.

D

Dargan, Marion.
Davenport, Frances G.
David, Charles Wendell.
Day, Clive.
DeForest, Sarah S.
Dodd, William E.
Donnan, Elizabeth.
Drane, Rev. Robert Brent.
Duncan, D. Shaw.
Dutcher, George M.

E

Eckenrode, H. J.
Ellery, Eloise,
Ellis, Ellen Deborah.
Emerton, Ephraim.
Evans, Austin P.

F

Fairbanks, Elsie D.
Farr, Shirley.
Fay, Bernard.
Fay, Sidney B.
Ferrin, Dana H.
Ferry, Nellie Poyntz.
Fitzpatrick, J. C.
Flick, Alexander C.
Flippin, Percy Scott.
Flournoy, F. R.
Fogdall, S. P.
Ford, Worthington C.
Foster, Herbert D.
Fox, Dixon Ryan.
Fox, George L.
Fuller, George N.

G

Gallagher, Katharine Jeanne.
Gardner, Elizabeth.
Garfield, H. A.
Gaskill, G. E.
Gaus, John Merriman.
Gazley, John G.
Gibbons, Lois Oliphant.
Gipson, Laurence H.
Godard, George S.
Gosnell, C. B.
Gould, Clarence P.
Graves, W. Brooke.
Gray, Helen.
Greenfield, Kent Roberts.
Greve, Harriet C.
Grizzell, E. D.
Grose, Clyde L.
Grouard, Maria Louise.
Guilday, Rev. Peter.

H

Hamilton, J. G. de Roulhac.
Haring, Clarence H.
Harrison, Fairfax.
Haskins, Charles H.
Hayden, Joseph R.
Hayes, Carlton J. H.
Hayes, Mercy J.
Haynes, George H.
Hazard, Blanche Evans.
Healy, Patrick J.
Hearon, Cleo.
Heckel, Albert K.
Hedger, George A.
Heston, Hiram.
Hickman, Emily.
Hicks, J. D. H.
Higby, Chester P.
Hill, Henry W.
Hockett, Homer C.
Hodder, F. H.
Hodgdon, Frederick C.
Holt, Lucius H.
Hoover, Thomas N.
Hoskins, Halford Lancaster.
House, R. B.
Hull, Charles H.
Humphrey, E. F.
Hunt, Gaillard.
Husband, W. W.

I

Irby, Louise.
Irons, Mrs. W. S.
Isanogle, A. M.

J

Jackson, W. C.
James, Alfred P.
Jameson, J. F.
Jenison, Marguerite E.
Jernegan, M. W.
Johnson, Allen.
Johnson, Edward P.
Jones, C. K.
Jones, Theodore F.

K

Kellar, Herbert A.
Kellar, Mrs. Herbert A.
Kellogg, Louise Phelps.
Kendrick, Benjamin B.
Kennelly, A. E.
Kennelly, Mrs. A. E.
Kerner, Robert Joseph.
Kilgore, Carrie B.
Kincaid, Marion B.
Kinchen, Oscar A.
Kinnicutt, Lincoln N.
Klein, Julius.
Klingenhagen, Anna M.
Knapp, Charles M.
Knauss, James Owen.
Knowlton, Daniel C.
Kollock, Margaret P.
Konkle, Burton Alva.
Korff, Baron S. A.
Korff, Baroness S. A.
Kull, Irving S.

L

Latané, John W.
Learned, H. Barrett.
Leavenworth, Charles S.
Leland, Waldo G.
Lerch, Alice Hollister.
Lewis, Hazel R.
Lima, M. de Oliveira.
Lingelbach, William E.
Lonn, Ella.
Lough, Susan M.
Lunt, W. E.
Lutz, Ralph H.

M

MacCarthy, Charles Hallan.
MacDonald, William.
McDougle, Ivan E.
McDuffie, Penelope.
Mace, W. H.
McFayden, Donald.
McGuire, C. E.
McKinley, Albert E.
McMaster, John Bach.
Manhart, George B.
Manning, William R.
Marshall, Thomas Maitland.
Martin, A. E.
Martin, Percy Alvin.
Mereness, Newton D.
Merritt, Elizabeth.
Minot, Jesse.
Mitchell, Margaret J.
Mitchell, Samuel Chiles.
Moffett, Edna V.
Mohr, Walter H.
Moore, Charles.
Morgan, Williams Thomas.
Morriss, Margaret S.
Munro, Dana Carleton.
Musser, John.
Muzzey, David Saville.

N

Nash, Elizabeth Todd.
Neilson, N.
Newhall, Richard A.
Nichols, Roy Franklin.
Nichols, Mrs. R. F.
Nicolay, Helen.
Norwood, J. Nelson.
Notestein, Wallace.
Noyes, Edmund S.
Nussbaum, Frederick L.

O

Oakes, George W. Ochs.
Oldfather, C. H.
Ott, Mary Castle.
Owen, Mrs. Marie Bankhead.

P

Packard, Laurence B.
Paetow, Louis J.
Paine, Mrs. Clarence S.
Paltsits, Victor Hugo.
Parish, John C.
Park, Julian.
Pasvolsky, Leo.
Patterson, David L.
Paullin, C. O.
Pearson, C. C.
Pearson, Henry G.
Pease, Theodore C.
Perkins, Dexter.
Pershing, B. H.
Phillips, Ulrich B.
Porcher, Isaac de C.
Priddy, Mrs. Bessie Leach.
Prince, L. Bradford.
Purcell, Richard J.
Putnam, Bertha Haven.
Putnam, Herbert.

R

Rammelkamp, C. H.
Ramsdell, Charles W.
Randall, J. G.
Randall, Mrs. J. G.
Randolph, Bessie C.
Read, Conyers.
Rees, Col. Robert I.
Reeves, Jesse S.
Reuter, Bertha Ann.
Rhodes, James Ford.
Richardson, Mrs. Hester Dorsey.
Richardson, Lula M.
Ridgate, Thomas H.
Riley, Franklin L.
Rippy, James Fred.
Robertson, James A.
Robinson, Morgan P.
Rosenberry, M. B.
Rosenberry, Mrs. M. B.
Rostovtzeff, Michael T.
Rowland, Dunbar.
Russell, Elmer Beecher.

S

Sanborn, Bernice.
Schafer, Joseph.
Schlesinger, Arthur Meier.
Sears, Louis M.
Shaw, Caroline B.
Shepherd, William R.
Sherwood, Henry Noble.
Shipman, Henry R.
Shoemaker, Floyd C.
Siebert, W. H.
Simmons, Lucy.
Sioussat, Mrs. Albert
Sioussat, St. George L.
Skeel, Mrs. Roswell, jr.
Spaulding, Col. Oliver L., jr.
Stevens, Earnest N.
Stevens, Wayne E.
Stilwell, Lewis D.
Stites, Mary A.
Stock, Leo F.

Stockton, Rear Admiral Charles H.
Stone, Mrs. Mary Hanchett.
Sullivan, James.
Sweet, William W.

T

Tall, Lida Lee.
Tanner, Edwin P.
Taylor, Col. John R. M.
Thompson, Frederic L.
Thorndike, Lynn.
Tschan, Francis J.
Tuell, Harriet E.
Turner, Edward Raymond.
Turner, Frederick J.
Turner, Morris K.

U

Ullrick, Laura F.

V

Van Bibber, Lena C.
Van Tyne, C. H.
Vaughn, Earnest V.
Vaux, George, jr.
Vincent, John Martin.

W

Ware, Edith E.
Washburn, Albert H.
Washburne, George A.
Weber, Nicholas Aloysius.
Wendell, Hugo C. M.
Wertenbaker, T. J.
Wertheimer, Mildred S.
West, Warren Reed.
Wheeler, Benjamin W.
White, Elizabeth B.
Whitney, Cornelia.
Wilkinson, William J.
Williams, Clarence R.
Williams, Judith B.
Williams, Mary Wilhelmine.
Wilson, George G.
Wilson, J. Scott.
Wilson, Lucy L.
Wing, Herbert, jr.
Wittke, Carl.
Wood, George A.
Woodfin, Maude Howlett.
Wriston, Henry M.
Wyatt, Frank S.

Y

Yoder, Bertha A.

Z

Zeligson, Maurice M.
Zook, George F.

II. PROCEEDINGS OF THE SIXTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PACIFIC COAST BRANCH OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

CLAREMONT AND LOS ANGELES, CALIF., NOVEMBER 26–27, 1920

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SIXTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PACIFIC COAST BRANCH OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The sixteenth annual meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association was held on Friday morning and Friday afternoon, November 26, at Pomona College, and on Saturday morning, November 27, 1920, at the University of Southern California. The annual dinner Friday evening was held at the Hotel Clark, Los Angeles, Calif., Prof. Herbert E. Bolton presiding. The presiding officers of the sessions were as follows: Friday morning, Prof. Waldemar C. Westergaard; Friday afternoon, Prof. R. G. Clelland; Saturday morning, Mr. W. F. Bliss, of the San Diego State Normal School.

The general topic for the Friday morning session was "Opportunities for historical research." The first paper of the session was presented by Prof. R. H. Lutz, of Stanford University, who described the Hoover collection at Stanford University. Professor Lutz prefaced his remarks with the statement that the Hoover collection may be approached for study and historical research from almost any angle. He limited his remarks, however, to a discussion of three general phases—(1) the gathering of material; (2) its classification; (3) the most important fields for historical research.

(1) The idea and general plan of starting the Hoover collection was first brought to the attention of Mr. Herbert Hoover almost at the beginning of the World War, when it was pointed out to him that a collection of war documents on all phases of the war would be of inestimable value in later years. The active gathering of documents, pamphlets, and papers of all kinds was started under the direction of Mr. Hoover at the beginning of the work of the Committee for the Relief of Belgium. His chief assistants were Profs. E. D. Adams and Lutz. Documents were collected from every source possible, large collections of invaluable material being secured in London, Brussels, and Paris, and all through the eastern European States, whole collections of private documents sometimes being purchased containing material which now can not be duplicated in the original. The process of gathering material for the Hoover collection still continues, as there remains much to be collected. It must be secured within the next few years or else be lost. This work is now going on all over the world, in every country which was at all affected by the war, and material is constantly coming in.

Contents: The Hoover collection is one of the largest of its kind in the world, being one of three great collections similar in character, the other two being that of the Library of Congress at Washington and the Musée de la Guerre at Paris, France. The collection contains over 80,000 titles and has a value roughly estimated at $200,000.

(2) In classifying the material, five main groups have been established.

(*a*) Government documents of all kinds bearing on the period of the war from 1914 to 1919. These include records and reports relating to the economic, industrial, and food conditions during the war in practically every country in the world. In addition, this group contains a great wealth of documents of a military and educational nature, nearly every government having gladly sent in whole collections of documents and other material on these subjects, giving a very complete history of that country in practically all its different phases of life during the war.

(*b*) Delegation propaganda at the time of the Peace Conference. This includes the publications and propaganda of all kinds from over 70 delegations with their claims which were represented before the Peace Conference. It also includes propaganda material of an unauthentic nature issued or published by opposing delegations to further their interests and injure those of their opponents, as in the case of Italy. From Italy came considerable propaganda purporting to be the claims of Yugoslavia, and Yugoslavia in turn published propaganda purporting to be the claims of Italy. A similar case was that of the Zionists and the Anti-Zionists. Reliable and authentic material containing the claims of these nations was secured by going direct to the various delegations themselves.

(*c*) Society publications of all kinds. This group includes the publications of the French war societies, very complete in nature and of great historical value; publications of 300 British societies; of 200 societies in the United States; also other miscellaneous publications from societies all over the world, in both neutral and belligerent countries; others are yet to be secured. The group includes also the publications of some societies which were afterwards suppressed.

(*d*) The complete archives and files of the Committee for the Relief of Belgium. The Belgium Government was very grateful for the services rendered by this commission and has given an immense amount of material to the Hoover collection. Documents from this source still continue to come in.

(*e*) Miscellaneous material of all kinds pertaining to the war. This includes odds and ends of picturesque publications; propaganda sheets in Belgium and in Germany and in Italy; Hungarian propaganda sheets; propaganda of the Bolsheviki in eastern Europe; trench papers and other similar curiosities; also a selected bibliography of books on

the World War, written in the United States, England, France, and in other countries throughout the world.

(3) The fields of research may be divided into eight general classes, in all of which the Hoover collection offers a vast amount of original material:

(*a*) The social, political, and economic phases of the war as affecting England, France, and Belgium. The Government of Belgium has sent in practically everything published in that country.

(*b*) Political, economic, and social life of Germany, Austria, and Bulgaria during the war.

(*c*) The study of government documents illustrating the change in the life of European governments during the war.

(*d*) The psychology of the Peace Conference; its plans, claims of the delegations, their desires and antagonisms, with a comparison of their claims and adjustments as shown by the peace treaty.

(*e*) The history of the birth of new states: There is sufficient material now at Stanford University on which to write extensive monographs.

(*f*) The field of international law and diplomacy.

(*g*) The study of newspaper collections, of which there is a complete catalogue of the most prominent papers in the United States and in Europe during the entire period of the war. There is also the library of the British War Office. Both contain a wealth of propaganda material, offering an intensely interesting study.

(*h*) The field of philanthrophy and the war; the record of how the United States fed a great part of Europe; this being one of the largest fields for research.

The second speaker, Prof. P. A. Martin, of Stanford University, presented "The opportunities for historical research in Latin American history," stating that the field of Latin American history until recent years has been largely neglected, most of the research work that has been done lying chiefly in the field of diplomacy. At the present time there is already considerable material for research study at Stanford University in the great number of documents of the period of the World War, secured from all the Latin-American countries for the Hoover collection. Similar documents on early periods have been secured from most of the South American Governments.

Materials for the study of Latin American history: Besides the immense amount of source material now to be found in the Hoover collection, there are a number of other collections at Stanford. A fine collection of material on Brazil from the time of its independence from Portugal has been secured through the indefatigable efforts of Dr. J. C. Branner, of Stanford University, who spent many years there. There is also an entire set of the Brazilian Historical Review from its first issue in 1842. There are in addition a complete set of

laws and Government publications from the time of the independence of Brazil from Portugal in 1822, and other publications of an economic and social nature. The aim is to build up a collection of original source material on Portugese-American history at Stanford.

Another collection has been made by Professor Coolidge, of Harvard University, which consists of the private library of the librarian of the Government of Chile, which is very complete in nature, being valued at $125,000. Still another collection of materials for research study is that which has been secured by Prof. Hiram Bingham, at Yale University, on the wars of independence of the South American Republics. Other collections of material in this country are those of the Library of Congress, the University of Texas, and the complete library of Dr. Oliveira Lima, former ambassador from Brazil to the United States, on Brazilian history, which is now in the possession of the Catholic University at Washington and is considered the finest collection of its kind outside of Brazil. Further, there are the archives of the Department of State, rich in material, but which are closed at present.

THE FIELDS FOR RESEARCH IN LATIN-AMERICAN HISTORY.

The colonial period of South American history; a great many topics yet to be developed; a great deal of material also to be had at Mexico City.

The study of institutions, their growth and development in Latin-American history, e. g., the Audiencia.

The study of vice-royalties, of captaincies-general, of royal patronage, and of the early financial systems.

The Spanish-American wars for independence. This includes the study of famous leaders such as Bolivar, San Martin, Cortez.

Nationalism and the development of the new states: Opportunities for research as to the lives and achievements of the great leaders of this period, Maximilian in Mexico; the lives of Presidents of the South American Republics, as Sarmiento; all these topics remain to be developed. There are ample opportunities for further research in the fields of economics, sociology, and political science, the slave trade in Brazil offering a vast field in this connection.

There is at present a great demand for the services of men who are fitted for this type of work to assist not only in making these investigations but in offering assistance both to the United States and to the various Latin-American Governments in establishing closer relations between these countries.

Opportunities for the publication of all research work of this character are offered not only in the publications of this country but also in South America in such publications as the Hispanic American Historical Review and others.

The Huntington Library collection of American history was described by Doctor Cole, curator. The collection of American history material in the Huntington Library, which is soon to be open to the public and for research work, is of immense value. Although complete in itself, it forms but a small part of the great collection which is now being placed in the Huntington Library. The American history collection is classified as follows:

(a) The period of discovery and exploration:
  (1) A number of original source books, which begin with the first Latin edition of the letters of Columbus.
  (2) The letters of Vespucius.
  (3) The Cortez letters, both the Latin and also one French edition.
  (4) The Las Casas tracts.
  (5) The works of Peter Martyr.

(b) The period of colonization and settlement:
  (1) The MSS. of Elliott's Indian Bible and translations.
  (2) The first almanacs printed in New York—the works of Bradford, etc.
  (3) Materials on the settlement of Virginia—Captain John Smith's History of Virginia, with maps.

(c) The Revolutionary period:
  (1) The original MSS. of the letters of George III to his Privy Councilors regarding the independence of the American Colonies; the minutes of the Privy Council.
  (2) Eight hundred Tory pamphlets issued in New York during the Revolutionary War period.

(d) The War of 1812:
  (1) A complete collection of original materials, military, political, and economic in character.

(e) The period of the Civil War:
  (1) The MSS. of Union and Confederate generals; their letters and diaries.
  (2) A complete bibliography of books on the war in all its phases.

(f) Other original MSS. material:
  (1) The letters of John Fiske.
  (2) The letters of Sherman, and letters and writings of Abraham Lincoln.

(g) Materials on the history of California:
  (1) The collection of Mr. Alexander MacDonald—supplementing to a great degree the Bancroft collection at the University of California.
  (2) Old Spanish and Mexican MSS.

Lack of time prevented the reading of the following paper, "A brief statement of the opportunities for historical research in Hawaii," by Prof. K. C. Leebrick, of the University of Hawaii:

Hawaii offers an unusually unique and rich field for the historical student. The source materials are well preserved. Most of them are gathered together in or about Honolulu so that they are easily accessible and ready for study. A guide to the materials and archives is one of the tasks that needs be undertaken at once.

The primitive and unwritten history of the Hawaiian Islands can be studied from unusually large collections of material remains of all kinds. The Bishop Museum has carefully collected almost everything that will help to preserve the life and customs of the Hawaiian people or throw light upon the past history of the people and the country. A large staff of well-trained men and women are constantly at work collecting, arranging, and recording materials. The museum with its rich collections, its reports, and its library, gives the student materials admirably arranged and preserved for this use. There are other lesser collections. The original dwellings, settlements, and other remains are within easy reach of the worker.

The entire written history of the Hawaiian people and islands lies within a very recent period. The Spanish knew of the existence of the islands, but so far little has been found of record as to this early discovery. From the time of Captain Cook's discovery of the islands in 1778, very good descriptions of the people and the islands have been made at frequent intervals by observers, of several nationalities,

and by trained searchers in almost every field of knowledge. These records are here. Thus there is a very complete record of the people before their lives and history were altered by contact with another civilization. Europeans from the very first have endeavored to make a complete record of this people, of their traditions and folklore, and of their political history.

The political union of the islands was only achieved in 1795, after the coming of Europeans, and very largely by their aid and advice. There is a considerable body of original manuscript material, in English, covering this most vital period, which saw not only the unification of the archipelago but the modification of the customs and institutions of the people, due to European influence.

The Hawaiian people were given a written language by the missionaries who arrived in the islands in 1820. They had been sent out by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Since that time the missionary has been the chief factor in the development of the people and the islands. There is a complete official record of the activities of this society in the English language. Other missionary societies soon came into the field; their records are also complete and available in English, French, and Latin. The various depositories, official and private, have an almost complete record of all official and vital private documents from this early date to the present. Complete files are available of most public documents; of all newspapers, magazines, books, and pamphlets printed here since the people had a written language. These are generally to be had in both English and Hawaiian. This is most unusual. There is a considerable amount of this material printed for the entire period. The first printing was done in the Hawaiian language in January, 1822, and printing in both Hawaiian and English has been continuous since that date. I am informed that complete files are available for almost all public documents and books printed from the very beginning.

Something has been done to collect documents and copies dealing with the relations with other countries. This will throw light upon the Hawaiian documents, which are almost absolutely complete.

Official documents have been unusually well kept and generally well preserved. This is especially true from 1845, when Mr. Wyllie became Minister of Foreign Affairs. A commission was appointed by the legislature in 1892 to arrange and preserve all official records. This commission did its work well. The oldest documents are English and are dated 1790.

The Hawaiian Historical Society was founded in 1892 and has done much to preserve and record public and private historical material of Hawaii. The "Reports" and "Papers" of the society are preserved in complete files and have just been carefully indexed. The society has built up a good working library of voyages to the islands; complete files of the missionary publications; of many of the books printed in Hawaii, in both Hawaiian and English; and of books printed about Hawaii. There is also a considerable quantity of pamphlet material; there are almost complete files of all newspapers and magazines; and there is some manuscript material, but it is not completely catalogued or arranged. The collection is well housed in the beautiful Territorial Public Library. There are excellent opportunities for the research student.

Shortly after the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States, Mr. W. C. Ford, of the Library of Congress, came to Hawaii to investigate the archives and to have at least a part of them transferred to Washington. He was urged to recommend that the archives remain here because of their local value; that he did on the condition that they be properly housed and cared for by the Territorial government. In accordance with this recommendation, the legislature of 1903 provided money for a building; the legislature of 1905 passed an act providing for a board of commissioners of public archives. Active work began on the collection

and preservation of the documents May 11, 1905. Since that time an excellent fireproof building has been erected on the capitol grounds and close to the Territorial library. Here are found the public records and documents of the Territory of Hawaii well arranged and stored so as to insure their preservation. The librarian, Mr. Robert C. Lydecker, has performed his duties well and is a mine of information regarding the records and history of Hawaii. The archive building is an excellent place to work. I think it sufficiently important to justify me in referring my readers to Mr. Lydecker's paper on "The Archives of Hawaii," printed in "Papers of the Hawaiian Historical Society," No. 13, 1906.

Since the organization of the College of Hawaii in 1907 as an agricultural and scientific college, the library of that institution has been a depository for the United States public documents. The College of Hawaii, now the University of Hawaii (1920), therefore has part of the official United States documents from about the year 1908. Every effort is being made to complete the files and to obtain as many of the volumes before this period as are available.

In addition to these sources one should call attention to the fact that many of the men who took the government into their hands in 1893 and organized an efficient government and opened the negotiations that led to annexation by the United States in 1898 are still living, and that they and their libraries are the best sources for this most interesting period. The writer wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to the Hon. S. B. Dole, former President of the Republic of Hawaii and the first governor after the annexation by the United States, for his advice and friendship. Acknowledgment is also due to the librarians of the libraries mentioned and to many of the "elder statesmen" of Hawaii.

The business session was called to order at 2 p. m., with President L. E. Young in the chair.

The committee on resolutions, Prof. P. A. Martin, chairman, presented the following resolutions which were adopted:

(1) Whereas, by the death of Prof. Arley B. Show, of Stanford University, this association has lost one of its oldest members and the profession an able and conscientious scholar who throughout his long years of special work in the training of history teachers not only was a careful and stimulating instructor of those who came under his guidance but also displayed a warm personal interest in their later individual progress, doing much to elevate the standards of history teaching by inspiring the members of the profession with his own enthusiasm for accurate scholarship and for sympathetic and thorough teaching: Be it

Resolved, That this association place on record its high appreciation of the unique and valuable service which Mr. Show rendered to the profession of history teaching on the Pacific coast, and the sense of loss, personal as well as collective, which his death has brought to them; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the president of Stanford University and to Mr. Show's family.

(2) *Resolved*, That the funds so generously provided by the State board of education for libraries in the elementary schools be supplemented by other funds, or be so administered that the intermediate schools or high schools may obtain some of the advantages accruing from this source.

The auditing committee, Professor Clelland, chairman, reported that it had examined the statement of account with vouchers of the secretary-treasurer and found the statement correct. The report was approved.

The committee on nominations, Prof. R. H. Lutz, chairman, presented as candidates: For president, R. C. Clark; vice president, P. J. Treat; secretary treasurer, J. J. Van Nostrand, jr. For the council,

in addition to the above, W. C. Westergaard, Miss Sara L. Dole, W. F. Bliss.

On motion, the nominations were closed and the secretary was instructed to cast the ballots for those nominees who were declared elected. On motion of the secretary, Prof. L. E. Young was appointed delegate of the branch to attend the meeting of the council of the American Historical Association at Washington D. C.

The business session then adjourned, to be followed immediately by the general session of the afternoon.

The first speaker was Prof. R. D. Hunt, of the University of Southern California, whose subject was "The contribution of political science to education." A résumé of Professor Hunt's address follows:

History, with man as its subject, is surely one of the subjects very intimately connected with human society. This being so, it is a subject that requires expert handling. It can not be confined to any restricted area or put in water-tight compartments and still be a subject dealing with life. More than this, education itself can not be considered liberal unless it has the broadest of foundations. No teacher can confine his work or his thinking to any one narrow field.

The end of our education is intelligent citizenship. The educated man is the broad man sharpened to a point; and this is the type of men that America needs to-day, as citizens, more than ever before in her history. And not only does America need this new strength, but Europe needs it even more urgently. The civilization in practically every country of Europe is at such a low ebb that in innumerable places it is at the point of death. Austria, as an example, subsists through charity alone. This condition offers a challenge to opulent America.

At such a time as this, America must not become the victim of the diseases of Spain or Rome. She must be strong in intellectual and spiritual life, and the college men must be the ones to furnish this strength for America. At the present time our people of all classes are obsessed with a spirit of lawlessness which must be overcome. Democracy is never safe in the hands of its enemies. In President Wilson's words, "What we seek is the reign of law, based upon the consent of the governed, and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind." But higher than law—the letter of which we can comply with—is the reign of *moral* law. America must learn to appreciate the value of morality.

Doctor Hunt gave several suggestions which should apply to the teaching of civics and citizenship as well as political science.

Stress fundamental principles. There is much ignorance of our economic fundamentals to-day.

Teach social science through social service. This point of view is a necessity for society's future leaders. Service is the aim.

Preach and practice political idealism. The common man must have his rightful place in political life, and that place must be elevated.

Restore a new type of Puritanism; "he that prays best and preaches best will fight best."

Put principle before expediency. We are all too much concerned with "putting it over" and too little with service of the public.

Exalt the spiritual meaning of life. Spirituality is the leaven of truth hidden in human thought, feeling, and action. Great grasp of religion will give to the historian insight and vision. In our education, the kind of education that a student gets

matters more than the quantity of it. He must have that which is quickened by spiritual life. In order to give this, a teacher must be a dynamic creative personality as well as a scholar, and college teachers must lead in spiritual, humanitarian vision. To do this will be to follow in the steps of the world's greatest teachers, for all of them have placed the emphasis on *life*.

The second speaker, Dr. George S. Sumner, took as his subject, "The importance of economics in the training and teaching of history."

Résumé: What does it profit a man to deal simply with the facts of history? The vital thing is *movement*. We must try to ascertain the motivating forces in all cases. To do this, a study of the fundamental facts of economics is necessary. Doctor Sumner would not say that the economic treatment of history is the only one to be given attention; but he does feel that of the various forces that are behind history, the economic force is the strongest. Next to this, will probably come the psychological force.

Thus, history is a means to the twofold end of vitalizing the movements of life and of giving application to present-day problems as they are seen in relation to the past.

Then, economics must not be given a separate treatment; it must be placed in its proper position with respect to the great movements of humanity. The fall of Rome had its economic problem above everything else; Turkey's condition can be explained largely from an economic viewpoint; the Spanish War of 1898 had its economic causes. We must get the benefit in our present life of the economic mistakes of the past. The actual economic condition in the past, as well as in the present, and not a theoretical condition, must be the basis of all of our present study of economics.

Mr. Victor Farrar, of the University of Washington, then spoke on "The United States policy with regard to Alaska."

Mr. Farrar gave in outline an account of his study with reference to the Alaskan question. In brief, he said that the treaty with Russia of 1824 did not define the boundary of Alaska and ended in our denial of Russia's title to Alaska. In 1838 we had not admitted Russia's title more than to say that she had a sphere of influence. Unless Russia acquired the title before 1840, she did not have it in 1867, for we know that she did not acquire it after 1840. The British negotiations suggest that such title was never obtained. But at any rate we cleared the title when our Government purchased the Alaskan Territory.

The meeting than adjourned.

The annual dinner was attended by 28 members. All present were inspired by the presidential address of Professor Young, who impressed us with his eloquent and forceful remarks. Speaking as he did out of the fullness of his experience and study and not from notes,

the president suffers at the hands of an untrained reporter. The subject, "Religious influences in the history of the West," was chosen because the speaker had come to believe that there was something fundamentally deep in the spirit of the pioneer. The religious institutions of the West express one phase of this depth of feeling. Art and music are later expressions of this same idealism. Its emphasis upon education has been constant from the beginning. A spirit so many-sided in expression can not be neglected by the historian who wishes to interpret fully the age of the pioneer.

The teachers' session, held on Saturday, November 27, 1920, 9.30 a. m. at the University of Southern California considered the general topic: "The social sciences and education for citizenship in the schools." Mr. W. F. Bliss, State Normal School, San Diego, presiding, said:

To sum up in a phrase the central idea of thought so far, I should say the business of the historian is to seek ultimately for the idealism of the people he is writing about and describing, as expressed in economic activities and in other activities and institutions; and it is the business of the teacher to bring the pupils into contact with these ideals and to inspire them to live up to them in their life activities. It is in keeping with that thought that the program for to-day has been arranged.

Proposed programs.—Prof. E. Dawson, Hunter College, New York City:

As a university and college teacher, I am convinced that we have a tendency in America, and even in the West, to be academic. We have a tendency not to make use of our scientific knowledge for practical purposes. I am a political scientist. Mr. Richard S. Childs says: "There is such a thing as political science, but no real red-blooded American will confess it." When speaking to some one of my friends here this morning, I said something about teaching elementary political science in the high schools. He said, "Elementary?" Some think there is nothing in political science teachable in secondary schools. If that is true, I am in favor of eliminating it from the university. Political science is the organization of democratic government.

The purpose of teaching social studies is to introduce the graduates of our high schools to the problems which confront our community, in order that we may have leadership in the solution of these problems on the basis of scientific knowledge. The twelfth year course in problems of democracy is thought of by the commission as a course in the introduction of the solution of the problems of democracy through some knowledge of scientific economics on the one hand and scientific politics on the other. As I understand it, we have not a solution as yet.

If political science is to present to us an organization based on scientific study of human psychology and human practices in past democratic efforts, then our task in teaching political science in the schools is to present them, not with a description of the constitution of the State of California or of the State of New York, two instruments of which any civilized people ought to be ashamed, but the principle is to improve those instruments in order that our Government may no longer be what Elihu Root called "An invisible government." Our political science is academic. A very distinguished political science teacher recently said: "Not a single constructive book on political science has been written by a university professor in the last five years."

In the fourth year work of the high school, as is suggested by this bulletin, elementary economics and elementary political science is to be given. What has that course to do with the course in American history, which immediately precedes it, and the course in European history, which lies one year below? What kind of European history ought we to teach in the high school, after we have walked 10 blocks down the the streets of Los Angeles and seen the people? What do we want them to know?

The result of whatever history we teach should be to lead the student toward a hopeful evolution of the human race. I am confident that we have not reached, as President Butler said, "the top of the curve of western civilization." But unless we teach optimistic, constructive organization, we may possibly become pessimists. Therefore, the European history is the background of world history, into which we want to fit American history as the next step; that is, the people who wrote that report thought of those three years, not as three different courses, but as one course, beginning with whatever kind of foundation or basis we must lay down to introduce the person to American history and whatever there is about American history to help one understand the problems which confront us.

Discussion opened by Mr. R. L. Ashley, Pasadena High School:

It seems to me that after all this problem is a very much larger one than we have been making it. It is a problem of education of a group of boys and girls passing through a certain physical and mental stage in their existence. There are two bases upon which we can place this problem for the analysis or study of it. Professor Hoose said: "You are not teaching algebra; you are not teaching history; you are not teaching English. You are teaching John and you are teaching Sally." As a matter of fact, here we have a problem. These boys and girls come to us in their 'teens. In talking over the problems as to what we shall give them, what consideration do we give to the adolescent age, to mental and physical development, to psychical reactions?

Community civics is a study of group organization and functioning approached from the standpoint of the individual in his relation to the community or communities in which he lives. I believe the only way to organize the material in social science, which we are trying to present to the students, must be to take it up from the standpoint of civics—present-day institutions, present-day activities—and study the past from that angle. We must integrate the courses. I think not more than one year of social science ought to be required in the three years of the upper high school.

We must know more about the boys and girls we are teaching, because we don't know what to give them until we know something about them. When we know something about them we can group them. They are probably varying from 8 to 9 years, mental age, to 16 or 17. The student who is mentally 16 lives in an entirely different world from the 8-year-old. The first point which I wish to contend is this—that we shall study these students and get some kind of mental measurements. Let us find something about the mental age and classify according to mental age and different capacities.

The children have had a very direct reaction to their environment, to the studies they have had. They have been growing rather rapidly up to 10 and then rather slowly to 13. Their memories are probably good and formations within the brain are developing with such rapidity that if habits are formed at that time they are never forgotten, and if not formed, are probably never formed. The teaching of civics in the grades is almost absolutely a failure, probably because we are trying to teach the kind of civics we teach in high school. The brains of these students have not formed yet and it is impossible for them to get new points of view. Before this time they are in direct relation with those with whom they have immediate dealings. They can not see the relationship between themselves and any other group. At this

point, when students are just beginning to develop other-selfness, getting new viewpoints in connection with religion, themselves, the suggestion is made that they take up the study of group organization and the relation of the individual to the group. This seems to me one of the difficulties which the student can not possibly overcome. I think it will be possible only to take this up after students have developed this new sense of relationship.

Discussion continued by Miss Anna Stewart, Los Angeles High School:

I feel that the salvation of democracy lies with the leaders and not with the average.

My reaction to Bulletin No. 28 is this: A strong desire to come to the defense of history; and it seems to me that Mr. Ashley has laid the foundation for the defense of history. I am in full accord with making the social sciences function.

The bulletin says: "History, as it is usually taught, is not adapted to the needs of pupils of the ninth grade." The conclusion is: Teach social science instead. The bulletin further reads: "Children live in the present and not in the past. The past becomes educational to them only as it is related to the present." Then they draw the conclusion that history must be set aside or used only occasionally. "Here stories and pioneer stories are of use in the early grades because children react naturally to them." Children do react to these stories. So do I; so do you. I have three books at home that I am just reading. They are all biographies. Curiosity is a part of human nature and it seems to me we may depend upon children of the eighth and ninth grades being interested in these biographies. History is a record of human experience, and human experience is necessarily based on our instincts and interests. How can you teach history? For example, I would present to an American history class some such topic as this: "The strange way in which Egyptians raised their food." I would then ask them to compare this with the way in which California raises its food. Or I might ask them to compare present-day fighting with the fighting of the Assyrians. But no, this is too simple! We must rip up the course of study! This is a course on the art of fighting or this is a course on food study.

The bulletin says "Civics should precede later history courses." Why? Does it not carry its own interpretation? I should absolutely reverse that statement. The Los Angeles elementary schools are shot through with community civics. All that can be taught of human relationships is being taught throughout the elementary grades. We need a good strong socializing course in the normal schools for the preparation of our teachers to teach these subjects as they should be taught.

If we are going to presume that students will drop out at the end of the ninth or tenth year, what shall we offer them after civics? I would suggest a reading course, teaching them how to read magazines and books and how to use a library.

Knocking chronology seems to be the pastime of social science writers. The bulletin says to teach crusades chronologically if you want to, but when it comes to institutions it is necessary to describe them. Why do we care about descriptions of the church as an institution? Only because it played an important part in a great historical drama. The same might be said about feudalism. Feudalism is a part of the great movement of the Middle Ages, and its rise, supremacy, and decline are of interest to us.

Chronology functions horizontally as well as vertically. Chronology functions horizontally when we are studying parallel contemporary movements. For example, in studying slavery, can I take just slavery? No; I have to say slavery and the need for a great labor supply. Chronology functions vertically when we take things in sequence order. Grover Cleveland is quoted: "I do not understand any

theory unless I know how it came to be; I do not understand any problem unless I know how it came to be." That is chronology.

I am going to speak in defense of ancient history. It offers us an easier approach pedagogically and presents fewer details. The factors and viewpoints stand out and it is these that give us our ladder to the social sciences. We have a spiritual kinship with Judea, Greece, and Rome. Ancient history challenges attention. Things are different and arouse our curiosity. What was the cause of the recent war? I think you will find it in the heart of the ancient world as much as anywhere else. Zimmerman, in Nationality and Government, writes: "It is not the principle of nationality that would bring peace and good government to Europe, but the principle of toleration."

Why should chronology be put in opposition to sociology? I believe they are Siamese twins, myself. A social worker recently said: "First we locate the family—ancestry, time, place, circumstances, etc." Historically speaking, it is chronology that does that for us. "Until we place the family, we can do nothing for them," continued the social worker. I conclude, then, that as to the chronological plan there are no gaps that are more serious than any other plan. The social plan is easier pedagogically. It offers all that any other plan offers and something more. That something more is the very essence of history itself.

Turning to the California situation, and recognizing that it may be unlike that of other places, how shall we organize the high school? I think four years can be used to very great advantage. There should be a citizenship course every term. I am not sure the social science department should always get it. The English department, I believe, should sometimes have it. In our high school, in B-9, they have patriotic ballads and debates. In the A-10 there are courses on vocational guidance. Already the English department is doing very definite work. I should like to see it more definite.

Bulletin No. 28 does not wholly apply to California. Ninth-year civics is undesirable because it eliminates twelfth-year civics. It is practical and definite, not vaguely socializing. We need leadership, but we can't get it from the man with the dinner pail or from the newsboy. We can get it from the high-school students. I don't think we spend much time on the dry outlines of the constitution. It is always the informing principle that we are concerned with. In handling our material we should have our approach vary; otherwise, the thing becomes monotonous. In the senior year it might be approached in this manner: First, state the problem; secondly, survey it historically. In organizing a course of study I have always been guided by the one keynote, "integration." In the selection of material it has been the interpretation of experience. What do I mean by "integration"? I mean this: I don't have a current events class, but every single social science class uses current events in one way or another—events related in some way to the subject under consideration.

III. PROCEEDINGS OF THE SIXTEENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

Washington, December 28, 1920

Reported by

JOHN C. PARISH

Secretary

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SIXTEENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

Reported by JOHN C. PARISH, *Secretary*

The sixteenth annual session of the conference of historical societies met at Washington, D. C., in joint session with the National Association of War History Organizations, on Tuesday morning, December 28, 1920, with Mr. James Sullivan, State historian of New York, in the chair. Three papers were presented to the conference. Mr. Karl Singewald, of the Maryland War Records Commission, read a careful survey of "Progress in the collection of war history records by State war history organizations." Mr. Albert E. McKinley, of the University of Pennsylvania, followed with a paper on "Suggestions and plans for State and local publications on war history." The third paper was presented by Mr. Joseph Schafer, of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, on the subject of "Coordination of historical societies within the States." The discussion of this paper was led by Mr. Worthington C. Ford, of the Massachusetts Historical Society, and was participated in by various delegates to the conference. The text of these papers and an account of the discussion which followed are given in the later pages of these proceedings.

The meeting was followed by a business session presided over by the chairman of the conference, Mr. George S. Godard, State librarian of Connecticut. Mr. John C. Parish, secretary of the conference, reported informally on activities for the year. Announcement of the meeting was sent out in November to all the societies, together with questionnaires as to conditions and activities and a reminder of membership dues, upon which the conference was largely dependent for its existence. At the time of the meeting about 90 replies from the questionnaires had been received and dues had come in sufficiently to cover the expenses of the year and leave $73.24 in the treasury. The secretary, in his report to the council of the American Historical Association, had asked for a renewal of the appropriation of $25 from that body, which was granted.

The secretary stated that it was the intention to publish the proceedings of the conference in separate form during the year without waiting for the reprint from the annual report of the American Historical Association. The proceedings for the year 1917 had been dis-

tributed to the societies and included reports on over 400 societies, the largest number yet listed.

It was recommended by the secretary that the conference proceed definitely to the carrying forward of two movements which have long been agitated and to that end he proposed that two active committees be appointed, one to take steps for the publication of a handbook of historical societies, the other to take action with reference to a continuation of Griffin's Bibliography of American Historical Societies.

The following motions were then carried by the conference:

Moved, that a committee of three be appointed by the chairman of this conference to lay plans and provide media for the compilation and publication of a handbook of American historical societies.

Moved, that a committee of three be appointed by the chairman of this conference to lay plans and provide media for the compilation and publication of a continuation of the 1905 volume of Griffin's Bibliography of American Historical Societies through the year 1920.

The chairman later appointed the following members of these committees:

The committee on the handbook.—Mr. George N. Fuller, of the Michigan Historical Commission; Mr. Solon J. Buck, of the Minnesota Historical Society; Mr. John C. Parish, of the State Historical Society of Iowa.

The committee on the Griffin bibliography.—Mr. Joseph Schafer, of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin; Mr. Appleton P. C. Griffin, of the Library of Congress; Mr. Julius H. Tuttle, of the Massachusetts Historical Society.

Mr. Dunbar Rowland, chairman of the committee on cooperation of historical societies and departments presented the following report which was adopted by the conference:

To the Conference of Historical Societies:

The committee on cooperation of historical departments and societies submits this its seventh and final report.

At the 1907 meeting of the association held in Madison this committee was appointed for the purpose of bringing about cooperation among historical agencies having common interests and holding membership in the American Historical Association.

The first report of the committee was submitted in 1908 at the Richmond meeting. The following recommendations made in that report were adopted by the conference:

"First. That the historical agencies of the Mississippi Basin join in a cooperative search of the French archives for historical material relating to the States embraced in that territory.

"Second. That a complete working calendar of all materials in the French archives relating to the Mississippi Basin be prepared by an agent appointed by the representatives of the conference having the matter in hand.

"Third. That the calendar when completed be published and distributed under the representatives of the conference.

"Fourth. That the necessary money for the preparation, publication, and distribution of the calendar be raised by voluntary contributions from the historical agencies represented in the conference."

The annual reports of 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913, and 1914 which appear in the annual reports of the American Historical Association for those years give a detailed account of the progress of the work, the sums contributed, and the expenditures of the fund to 1914.

In August, 1914, as the work of the committee in the French archives was nearing completion, France was invaded by the armies of Germany, and the state of war, which continued until November, 1918, compelled the postponement of the undertaking until the return of peace. For that reason no reports have been made to the conference since the meeting of 1914.

As soon as practicable after the defeat of Germany the work in the French archives was resumed. The work of editing and preparing the calendar for publication was also put in operation by the Department of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution, and this important task is now nearing completion.

The fund for calendaring this collection of archives concerning the history of the great Mississippi Basin was subscribed through the generosity of the following historical agencies: Alabama Department of Archives and History, Chicago Historical Society, Indiana State Historical Society, State Historical Society of Iowa, Kansas State Historical Society, Louisiana Historical Society, Michigan Historical Society, Mississippi State Department of Archives and History, State Historical Society of Missouri, Texas Historical Society, Wisconsin State Historical Society, and Clarence M. Burton.

The sums subscribed by each contributor appear in the report of the committee of 1913. In round numbers $3,000 was subscribed. There is now in the hands of the treasurer of the committee $355.69, and that amount is sufficient to complete the work.

The annual reports of the committee have made frequent mention of the expert service freely extended by the Carnegie Institution of Washington. We can not express too often our obligation to Dr. J. F. Jameson and Mr. W. G. Leland of the Department of Historical Research of that institution—to Doctor Jameson for securing the cooperation of the Carnegie Institution, and to Mr. Leland, the representative of the committee in direct charge of the work in Paris.

Your committee recommends the acceptance of the proposal of the Carnegie Institution to edit, publish, and distribute the calendar. In no other way could that part of our undertaking be done quite so well. The details of the proposal will be presented to the conference at this meeting by a representative of the Department of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution. The progress of editing, publishing, and distributing the calendar will be reported to the conference by those having in charge that part of the work.

May we again express our great obligation to the historical agencies which made possible the success of our undertaking by making liberal and unselfish subscriptions to the calendar fund.

The principle of cooperative work along such lines is most helpful and beneficial to the societies engaging in it. Such work should by all means be continued.

We hope we may be permitted to say in this final report that the successful completion under the direction of this conference of the work of calendaring the French archives, in so far as they concern the Mississippi Valley, is of very great importance to the historians of the country. To have undertaken and finished a task of such magnitude is an achievement worthy of the highest praise.

It has been a privilege for the committee to act as the representative of the conference. You have made our duties most pleasant and agreeable. We thank you for giving us the opportunity to serve you. We report that our work is done, request the release of the committee, and file this our final report.

Respectfully submitted.

DUNBAR ROWLAND, *Chairman.*
WORTHINGTON C. FORD.
EVARTS B. GREENE.
J. F. JAMESON.
B. F. SHAMBAUGH.
EUGENE C. BARKER.

DECEMBER 28, 1920.

The following is a partial list of the delegates present at the session:

Abbot, Mrs. Louis A., State historian, District of Columbia.
Ambler, Chas. H., West Virginia University.
Belote, Theodore T., United States National Museum.
Bond, Beverly W., jr., University of Cincinnati.
Boyd, Wm. K., Trinity College, New York.
Callahan, J. M., West Virginia University.
Clark, William Bell, Pennsylvania War History Commission.
Conlan, Mrs. Michael, Oklahoma Historical Society.
Connor, R. D. W., North Carolina Historical Commission.
Doane, Rev. R. B., North Carolina.
Eaton, Allen, Russell Sage Foundation.
Eckenrode, H. Z., Southern Historical Society.
Fitzpatrick, J. C., Library of Congress.
Ford, Worthington C., Massachusetts Historical Society.
Fox, Dixon Ryan, New York State Historical Association.
Fuller, George N., Michigan Historical Commission.
Godard, George S., Connecticut State Library.
Handman, M. S., University of Texas.
Heckel, A. K., Lafayette College.
Hoover, T. N., Ohio Historical Commission on War Material.
House, R. B., North Carolina Historical Commission.
Husband, W. W., Vermont Historical Society.
Jenison, Marguerite E., Illinois Historical Library.
Latané, Edith, Mary Baldwin Seminary, Staunton, Va.
Latanè, John H., Johns Hopkins University.
Latané, Lucy T., Maryland War Records Commission.
Leland, Waldo G., Carnegie Institution of Washington.
McKinley, Albert E., Pennsylvania War History Commission.
Paine, Mrs. Clara S., Mississippi Valley Historical Association.
Palsits, Victor H., New York Public Library.
Parish, John C., State Historical Society of Iowa.
Parker, H. Gilbert, Office of adjutant general of Delaware.
Pease, T. C., Illinois State Historical Library.

Robinson, Morgan P., Virginia State Library.
Rowland, Dunbar, Mississippi Historical Society.
Ryan, Daniel J., National Catholic War Council.
Schafer, Joseph, State Historical Society of Wisconsin.
Schlesinger, Arthur M., State University of Iowa.
Shoemaker, Floyd C., State Historical Society of Missouri.
Sioussat, Mrs. Albert, Maryland Society of the Colonial Dames of America.
Steiner, Bernard C., Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, Md.
Spaulding, Col. Oliver L., Historical Branch, General Staff, United States Army.
Stokes, Horace W., Frederick A. Stokes Co., publishers.
Sullivan, James, New York State Historical Association.
Vincent, John Martin, Johns Hopkins University.
Wilson, J. Scott, Virginia War History Commission.

Upon consultation with the handbook committee, which has laid plans and begun work on the preparation of a handbook of the societies, it has seemed best not to publish in the proceedings at this time the data secured in November and December, 1920, from approximately 90 of the societies. This material will be used by the committee in the preparation of the more comprehensive publication.

PAPERS AND DISCUSSION.

PROGRESS IN THE COLLECTION OF WAR RECORDS BY STATE WAR HISTORY ORGANIZATIONS[1]

By Karl Singewald
Secretary, Maryland War Records Commission

The article, "The collection of State war records," by Franklin F. Holbrook, secretary of the Minnesota War Records Commission, printed in the American Historical Review, October, 1919, is a conspectus of the origin, organization, and activities of the various State war history agencies, although not arranged by States, but topically.

The collection of material relating to the war was carried on, of course, to some extent from the beginning of the war by all active State historical commissions, historical societies, libraries, etc. The compilation of war records in a thorough way, however, in most cases could not be done by such institutions without a great extension of their activities, requiring special appropriation and extra staff. Those agencies that were able to take up the undertaking in a thorough way from the beginning were in a most fortunate and advantageous posi-

[1] In connection with the preparation of this paper, questionnaires were sent to all of the States addressed to the agencies known to be engaged in war history work. Replies were received from 20 States. Some information was already in hand in regard to the work in most of the States. All comparisons made in this paper must be qualified as being based upon the incomplete information available.

tion. States reporting systematic collection of material during the war include Alabama, Iowa, New York, and Ohio.

General realization of the importance of the compilation of war records, and financial provision for this purpose, came after the first year of our participation in the war. Action was largely through the State councils of defense, pursuant to recommendation by the Council of National Defense, at the instance of the National Board for Historical Service. In a few States the war history committees appointed were to function independently, but in the great majority of States they were to act through or in conjunction with existing State agencies—historical commissions, historical societies, State libraries, or universities.

The next stage was legislative action. In practically all of the States where the historical work was under way it was continued by legislative enactment and appropriation. At present nearly all of the States are engaged to some extent in the undertaking. A number of the States are known to be working in a large way—with a comprehensive program and somewhat adequate facilities. These States are Alabama, California, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

In carrying on the undertaking the State agencies very generally have enlisted county and local cooperation. In most cases special historical committees have been named, but local historical societies and libraries also have been utilized. In New York the act of April 11, 1919, provided for appointment of local historians by local appointing boards. Approximately 1,500 appointments were authorized thereby, and about 50 per cent have been made. In some States, including California, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin, appropriations for the local work have been made by local governments, usually small in amount—$100 to $500, but large amounts, in some cases; for instance, the city of Buffalo, $40,000. Illinois reports that in several counties sufficient funds have been available to employ some one to take charge of the work. Pennsylvania states that local provision was made very generally either by public appropriation or by turning over balances of welfare or welcome funds. In many of the States supplies have been furnished by the State office, and in a few States small allowances made for local expenses.

The general experience with the local committees is that they are very uneven in their work. In the majority of cases the results are not very satisfactory. Large results are obtained only where some qualified person is found willing to give considerable time and attention to the work. The following States report more than ordinary

success in the local work: Illinois, a number of excellent county collections and several published histories; Indiana, complete reports covering the organizations as scheduled in Bulletin No. 10 from more than half of the 92 counties in the State; Michigan, county committees working pretty generally; Pennsylvania, a considerable number of counties doing excellent work. Naturally, the importance of the local war history is recognized, and the compilation of the records taken up effectively, in greater degree where the counties and cities are of considerable size and importance. The city of Buffalo, for instance, appropriated $40,000 and has published a war history.

A survey of war history work State by State would be of great interest, but is impracticable in this paper, both on account of limitation of space and of incompleteness of information in hand. It will be possible herein merely to discuss briefly the larger phases of the undertaking and to indicate roughly the progress made in some of the States.

INDIVIDUAL MILITARY RECORDS

In a few States, including New Hampshire and Rhode Island, record was kept systematically during the progress of the war of those who entered the military and naval forces. Generally, however, this was not done, and the later efforts to compile State rosters have proven very difficult.

No part of the war records work was so generally undertaken by the States as that of obtaining the records of the soldiers and sailors. In most of the States forms were prepared and campaigns were conducted with wide publicity. Cooperation of patriotic organizations was enlisted and local committees employed.

In general, the success of these efforts has not been very marked. The indifference of the men has proven a serious obstacle. A few States report unusally large results. A statement from New Hampshire, as of March, 1920, reported 85 to 90 per cent obtained. In South Dakota, by act of legislature, the assessors were instructed to make a canvass throughout the State, without extra compensation, however. In this way, about one-third of the records were obtained. This was followed up by a systematic campaign through the schools, with good results. South Dakota now reports a roster containing names beyond the number credited to the State by the departments in Washington, but no statement is in hand of the percentage of records filled out. Maryland has obtained nearly one-half of the records. For Baltimore city, the percentage is over one-half, due largely to active cooperation by the police department. In Minnesota, the administration of the bonus act was utilized as an opportunity to obtain the records. Minnesota reports over 80,000 records out of 108,000 applying for the bonus. Pennsylvania reports over 37,000

in the State files, 45,000 in the hands of the Philadelphia committees, and thousands in the hands of other local committees. In Philadelphia canvass was made by the police department.

California has pressed the collection of these records, especially through the local committees. Results are very incomplete, but arrangements have been made for the American Legion to conduct a systematic campaign whereby it is hoped to obtain most of the records. Kentucky plans binding the service record sheets for each county into a volume, to be placed in the county clerk's office when completed and to be protected by being recorded as permanent county records.

Special attention, naturally, has been given to the compilation of rosters and records of those who died in the service, and of those who received decorations and citations. Most of the States have this part of the work pretty well up.

In most of the States effort has been made to obtain—along with the records—photographs and such material as diaries, letters, and narratives. Results obtained in this way have not been conspicuously large. Illinois, however, reports a large collection of soldiers' letters, through special effort and cooperation of organizations such as the Service Star Legion. New York has collected thousands of letters through a clipping service. Pennsylvania reports 8,000 photographs, thousands of letters, and a few diaries.

The entire aspect of this matter of individual military records was changed greatly when it became assured that the departments in Washington would furnish to the several States abstracts of the service records. The Adjutant General of the Army was given an appropriation for this purpose by the act of July 11, 1919. Thus far the records of casualties have been sent to the States. A similar appropriation was made to the Bureau of Navigation, Navy Department, by the act of June 4, 1920. It is expected that the work will be completed by the end of the fiscal year. The Marine Corps, also, is preparing records for the States.

These official records are being sent to the adjutants general of the States. A number of the States plan publication of military rosters. Such publication generally is to be by the adjutant general or in conjunction with his office. In view of these official records, some of the State war history agencies have concluded to leave the matter of the individual military records entirely with the adjutants general. It may be remarked, however, that the records furnished from Washington are brief abstracts of the service records, with very little of the further biographical information called for by the forms used by the State agencies.

The basis followed by the War and Navy Departments in crediting men to the several States is the home addresses given at the time

of entering the service. The records furnished to a State, therefore, will not include former residents who were living elsewhere at the time of entering the service, nor persons living in the State at the time of entering the service, but who gave their addresses in the State of their former residence and family connections. Moreover, of course these records will not include those who served in the military forces of the Allies. Pennsylvania, it may be mentioned, reports having obtained a list of 3,583 men from the State who entered the British service.

In addition to the problems suggested in the last paragraph, there are other questions of inclusion arising in compiling the military roster to include those who served on the Mexican border in 1916. A little nearer is the case of service in the National Guard on Federal duty after April 6, 1917, but prior to the incorporation of the National Guard into the United States Army, August 5, 1917. The United States Public Health Service, in terms of the act of Congress, was made a part of "the military forces of the United States." A part of the personnel of the Lighthouse Service, by virtue of act of Congress, was transferred to the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, but is not counted as part of the Navy. Even the United States Coast Guard records are not in the possession of the Navy Department, although the entire personnel was enrolled in the Naval Reserve Force.

Altogether, unless the State roster is based simply upon service in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps according to the official records furnished from Washington, the task of compilation will be very difficult and the results at best not entirely complete. The only way to obtain the names not included in the records sent from Washington is by building up a State roster systematically from local sources.

MILITARY UNITS AND ESTABLISHMENTS

Much attention is being given to the collection of material relating to military units composed largely of men from the respective States, and to camps and other military establishments located in the State during the war.

There are, of course, two sources of such material—(1) local sources; (2) the records in Washington. In respect to military units, the records obtainable from what may be termed local sources include:

Histories. (*a*) Manuscript histories of nearly all units were prepared under official direction before demobilization. These are usually short and sketchy. (*b*) Printed histories of many units have been published, in many cases under the auspices of veterans' organizations of the respective units.

Diaries, narratives, etc., by members of the units.

Copies of official papers—orders, reports, maps, etc.—retained by members of the units.

Newspapers or news bulletins issued by the units.

Photographs and other exhibits.

A number of States have been very active in collecting such material from the returned service men. It may be mentioned that Pennsylvania has obtained copies of a large part of the orders and messages of the Seventy-ninth Division.

The records in Washington are, of course, of prime importance. Every unit, upon demobilization, was required to pack up all of its records and ship them to The Adjutant General in Washington. Here should be complete sets of official papers and documents of the units, whereas records collected from local sources are generally fragmentary. Thus far, very little use has been made of the records in Washington by the State agencies. The photographs taken by the Signal Corps of the Army are the most important general source of photographs.

In the case of camps and military establishments, the classes of material and the sources are similar to those of military units. A number of States report considerable collections of historical reports, camp newspapers, photographs, etc. Here, again, there has been little use as yet of the great store of records in Washington.

INDIVIDUAL CIVILIAN RECORDS

A number of States, in the compilation of the individual military records, have included records of those who served with the military or naval forces as workers under the welfare organizations—Red Cross, Y. M. C. A., etc.

Maryland has undertaken on a more comprehensive basis the compilation of individual civilian records. The purpose has been to include the names of all Marylanders who rendered service of more than ordinary importance in relation to the war in a civilian capacity, whether in Government position, in industry, profession, relief activities, etc. The index includes the officers and leading workers of the principal war agencies in the State and in the several counties. Some idea of the degree of inclusion may be given by the statement that the index contains about 2,500 names for the entire State, as compared with about 62,000 in the military service. The persons whose names are in this index are requested to fill out a form of record and to furnish reports of their work.

California, also, has given special attention to obtaining full accounts of services of individual Californians in relation to the war in a civilian capacity. Some of the local committees have made use of questionnaires for this purpose. Mention should be made, also, of

Virginia's plan of selecting a roll of 100 Virginians who rendered the most distinguished war service. The records of the 100 will be published in the war history.

NONMILITARY WAR AGENCIES AND ACTIVITIES

Apart from the distinctly military activities, there were a number of agencies of prime importance conspicuously known as war agencies and activities, such as the Council of National Defense, War Industries Board, Shipping Board, Railroad Administration, War Loan Organization, Food Administration, Fuel Administration, American Red Cross, and the seven big welfare agencies operating under the supervision of the Commission on Training Camp Activities. These, however, are only the most conspicuous. The number of agencies, emergency and permanent, governmental and private, national and local, performing services of great importance in relation to the war is very large. Then, if we look beyond the more important agencies and activities, it is a fact that practically every organization and individual in the country did something in the general war effort.

In the endeavor to compile the war records, therefore, the problem is ever present of how far to go. In the widest scope, anything and everything pertaining to the life and activities of the people during the war period is part of the war record. The question of what to include arises both in respect to what organizations and activities to cover, and also as to what classes of records to gather.

In respect to organizations included, Pennsylvania has doubtless covered the field more extensively than any other State. About 105,000 pieces of mail have been sent out to about 65 groups, the organizations covered including not only the important war agencies, but also churches, schools, libraries, clubs and societies, banks, insurance companies, industrial and commercial establishments. Some 4,300 reports are in hand, including 1,081 reports from banking institutions and 961 from industrial establishments. Indiana, also, has requested reports from churches, fraternal orders, clubs, banks and manufacturing establishments, with "fairly satisfactory" results. In most of the States, the matter of obtaining reports from individual local organizations, such as churches, schools, clubs, banks, etc., has been left to the local committees.

In respect to material to be gathered, there is the broad general consideration that the State war history agencies are interested particularly in material of special State concern. In the case, however, of activities within the State that are part of the operations of organizations of a national scope, the States are interested in material relating to the national organization, as well as in material especially concerning the particular State.

Most of the State war history agencies have sets of formal publications of United States Government departments and services bearing on the war, whether collected specially or as part of the regular acquisitions of the institutions with which they are connected. The same is largely true of formal publications of the principal nongovernmental agencies of national scope performing service in relation to the war. When it comes to lesser material, such as pamphlets, periodicals, bulletins, circulars, posters, etc., and to the publications of the hundreds of less important agencies, the State collections are necessarily fragmentary. Alabama engaged in collection from the beginning of the war, and reports a very complete set of all material issued by the principal war agencies. Iowa and Pennsylvania also have important collections of material. Texas reports over 1,500 pamphlets relating to the war. The number of such publications issued altogether would run into the hundreds of thousands,

The problems in respect to gathering material issued by agencies of national scope may be understood from a few illustrations. Any collecting agency would eagerly receive such important acquisitions as a set of publications of the Committee on Public Information, or the war bulletins of the American Red Cross, or of the Y. M. C. A. A complete set, however, of books, pamphlets, periodicals, bulletins, circulars, etc., issued by Red Cross during the war would fill several shelves. Then there is a vast quantity of material not relating especially to the war, but of increased interest during the war. For instance, the bulletins of information and of instruction issued by the Department of Agriculture are regular publications, but during the war were of special use in stimulating food production. Publications, also, of the hundreds of religious, professional, trade, and other organizations of national scope are of some interest from the standpoint of war history. There is certainly no clear line of limitation in regard to such material, and, as already remarked, the collection of such material by the State war history agencies is rather desultory.

In regard to agencies and activities within the State, there is, of course, greater reason for systematic effort to make a complete collection of material. The distinctive effort in this field is to obtain historical reports, both of state-wide activities and of local activities. In a large percentage of cases it is necessary to have these reports specially prepared for the historical records. The reports by the States, generally, indicate a very fair measure of success along this line. Pennsylvania and Illinois have done especially well in obtaining reports from members of the draft boards.

A number of the States are making special efforts to secure the deposit of files and records of war agencies in the war records collections. Some of the most important records were required to be

shipped to Washington—notably, of the draft boards, Food Administration, and Fuel Administration. Minnesota reports, however, having obtained the files relating to war activities of the Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., A. L. A., J. W. B., W. C. C. S., U. W. W. C., and some of the branch offices of the United States Employment Service in the State. Texas, also, reports a very fair measure of success in obtaining the files of war work organizations such as the Liberty loan, war savings, Red Cross, Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., K. of C., W. C. C. S., and Salvation Army. Generally speaking, the most important files of war activities within the States are those of the State councils of defense or committees of safety. These files, of course, are in official possession of the States, and in a number of cases have come into the custody of the war history agencies The files of the women's section, Maryland Council of Defense, are an extremely valuable mass of material. The women's section was an exceptionally efficient organization, coordinating all women's activities in relation to the war, and the files containing regular, systematic reports of all departments and of the county chairmen.

WAR INDUSTRIES

The subject of war industries does not appear to have been taken up generally with any degree of thoroughness. In a number of States this is being left largely to the local committees.

Pennsylvania, where the industrial contribution was probably the most marked, has gone further than any other State in the compilation of the records. By considerable effort and expense, a list was compiled in Washington of Pennsylvania firms having Government war contracts. There were 2,732 Pennsylvania firms having direct war contracts. Questionnaires were mailed to the firms on this list. In the case of the most important industrial establishments, this was followed up by personal visit and research. Reports are in hand from 961 establishments. Excellent reports have been received from nearly all of the important establishments.

Illinois also reports having compiled a list of firms having war contracts, by assistance of the bureaus in Washington and of the Illinois Manufacturers Association. A questionnaire was sent out and a large percentage of returns received. Maryland, similarly, has compiled a list of firms, and is just sending out questionnaires.

PHOTOGRAPHS, POSTERS, AND OTHER EXHIBITS

A few words may be devoted especially to the subject of photographs, posters, and other exhibits. Many of the States report large collections of photographs—of individuals, of military units, camps, or other military activities, and of civilian activities in relation to the war. Texas has acquired 15,000.

Posters are of two classes—those used generally throughout the country, and those of local origin. Those of the first class are, of course, the more conspicuous, but those of the second class are of greater significance for the State collections. Illinois reports a collection of about 800 posters; Indiana, "a complete collection for all of the State drives"; New York, a collection of all important posters; Pennsylvania, 866 posters; Texas reports a collection of about 2,000 posters, broadsides, etc.—1,200 American, the rest foreign. The method of exchange has been utilized to good advantage.

Only a few of the State war history agencies appear to have given much attention to the collection of other exhibits. Minnesota states that, in cooperation with the museum department of the historical society, a noteworthy collection has been gathered of war relics and mementos, including military equipment and insignia, service flags, etc. Ohio, also, reports a large collection of emblematical material.

NEWSPAPERS

Fortunately, libraries very generally preserve newspaper files. In most States, therefore, files of newspapers with state-wide circulation and of some of the local newspapers are to be found in State libraries, and files of most local newspapers in local libraries. New York, for instance, reports that the State library maintains files of the principal newspaper of each county and of the leading city newspapers.

Most of the State agencies have made special efforts to obtain files for the war period of as many as possible of the newspapers published in the State. Such files, however, are difficult to obtain. Very few newspapers keep back copies other than a single file of their own, and a great many small local newspapers lack even a single complete file. California reports that several county committees have submitted complete files of local newspapers. The State war history department has over 50,000 clippings of war interest. Illinois has obtained a number of complete or partial files for 1917–18 besides the files regularly kept by the library. Indiana reports special effort, with fairly satisfactory results, to secure a complete file of at least one newspaper of each county for 1917–18. Items of war interest are clipped and mounted.

In addition to general newspapers, some attention has been given to the collection of special newspapers and periodicals. Ohio, especially, reports a very large collection of religious periodicals, trade, labor, and agricultural papers, and racial newspapers.

Generally speaking, excellent progress has been made in the work of the State war history agencies, but a great deal remains to be done in the collection of records, apart from the matter of publication. In California, the war history department is to be discontinued as

a separate department of the State historical survey commission in January, 1921. In some States, on the other hand, the increased facilities necessary for effective work have but recently been provided. In most of the States the work is proceeding actively, with prospect of continuance for some time to come.

There are it may be mentioned, a number of important special collections of material that are of direct interest to the States. These include the war records compiled by the National Catholic War Council, by the American Jewish Committee, and by the denominations of the Protestant Church. A description of such collections, however, is not within the scope of this paper.

PROGRESS IN THE COLLECTION OF WAR HISTORY RECORDS BY STATE WAR HISTORY ORGANIZATIONS

By Albert E. McKinley

Secretary of the Pennsylvania War History Commission

The topic of to-day embraces plans and suggestions for war histories by official State bodies. It excludes on one side the publication plans of the War and Navy Departments and other branches of the National Government, and on the other the more or less elaborate plans for more or less accurate histories by private publishing concerns.

Consideration of plans for publication came almost as early as the realization of the necessity for collecting data relating to the war history of our several States. In some cases publication was held consciously in view from the start. Thus the State Historical Society of Iowa stated in its publication "Iowa and War" (No. 19, January, 1919, p. 3), "Collection without compilation is fruitless, and compilation without publication is useless. The collection of the materials of war history should accompany the writing of that history, and the writing of the history should accompany the collection of the materials."

With this concept of the interrelation of collection, compilation, and publication, the Iowa society proceeded to outline a tentative plan for a history of Iowa's part in the World War, and also prepared a similar outline for a local or county history. At least four other States—Minnesota, Virginia, California, and Pennsylvania—have issued somewhat similar outlines, either for local or State histories, or both, which in some cases were based upon the Iowa outline.

It early became apparent that there were really three classes of historical material in which a State might be interested: (1) Service records of individuals, including casualties and citations in the military and naval service; (2) histories, narrative and documentary, of units in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, composed largely of

citizens of the interested State; (3) the internal history of the State in war time, including the operations of the National Government in the State, the activities of the State government, and the work of civilian individuals and organizations. Plans for publication in the several States from which reports have been received differ greatly in the attitude toward these three classes and in the agencies to which were intrusted the work of preparation for publication.

Individual service records.—At the outset of their work many of the war history bodies in the several States, basing their decision upon the experience of the Civil War, prepared service record blanks to be filled in by soldiers' families or, after return from the field, by the soldiers themselves. Such records might admittedly be inaccurate or incomplete, but they might contain material not included in The Adjutant General's Office, and until the records of the latter office were available they would be valuable for local historical purposes.

The action of Congress in the summer of 1919 in providing funds for sending transcripts of service records to the States and in directing that these records be sent to the adjutant general in each State has had several influences. In the first place, it promises to place at the disposal of the States the service records of their citizens much more quickly and at less expense to the States than was anticipated. It has tended to discourage the distribution, filling out, and collection of the local record blanks within the States, and it has placed in the hands of the adjutant general of each State the personal records of its citizens.

It is but natural, therefore, from the character of the usual duties of a State adjutant general and the records now being received from Washington, that plans for publication of individual war records should center largely in the offices of the adjutants general. The following statement from Delaware illustrates this policy:

> The Governor of Delaware has requested the adjutant general of this State to collect all available data in regard to the part played by the service men of this State in the World War, which includes biographies and photographs of the men who made the supreme sacrifice and the personal, family, and military records of the remainder of the men, and at the coming session of the general assembly next month to introduce such a bill to put in book form the above information, with, of course, separate chapters for those who died or were wounded or cited.

Indiana reports that the manuscript of a "gold star volume" is now ready for the press; and that the adjutant general will prepare for publication a State roster containing the names of all Indiana service men and the units to which they were attached. Iowa, with its roster commission, composed of the governor and the adjutant general, organized by act of assembly early in 1919, is probably better prepared than any other State to push the work of publication as

soon as the records are received from Washington. The adjutant general of Illinois has in contemplation the publication of a roster, which will occupy, according to estimates, 42 volumes. Missouri has a similiar work under consideration. For the two largest States —New York and Pennsylvania—the publication of an adequate roster is a stupendous task. Our presiding officer, Doctor Sullivan, estimates that 100 volumes would be necessary for the Empire State's records, and Pennsylvania's would not fall far behind that figure.

It thus appears that publication plans for individual service records are largely in the hands of the respective adjutants general, and that the ultimate decision upon publication is dependent upon the speed at which records are received from Washington (on December 1, 1919, only 11 per cent of the Army records had been received), upon the force at the disposal of the adjutants general for compilation and comparison, and upon the appropriation of funds for publication.

Histories of combatant units in which States are largely interested.—Most interest naturally centers in those Army units into which the State militia went. The militia companies and regiments had been a matter of local pride before the World War; their records up to 1917 are preserved in the offices of the adjutants general of the several States; their members were anxious to bring back with them an adequate record of what their units accomplished. Hence local patriotism combined with what is relatively an abundance of historical data makes the preparation and publication of unit histories of the militia comparatively a simple matter. Illinois has already sent to the press a history of the Thirty-third Division, prepared by Col. Frederick L. Huidekoper, who was division adjutant. The history will comprise three volumes, of which the first will contain a narrative history of division operations, and the other two will be devoted to maps and reports. Twenty thousand copies of the first volume will be distributed free to members of the division. An appropriation of $50,000 was made for this publication. In a similar manner the States of Michigan and Wisconsin made appropriations for a history of the Thirty-second Division.

But far more difficult is the preparation of a history of the units into which the selective service men entered. The men had no previous historical or personal associations with the unit; the officers were drawn from all over the Union; and the men themselves, or the officers did not usually show the same interest in bringing back the records of the units which is so apparent in the militia divisions and regiments. While a number of regimental and divisional organizations of the selective service units have been formed, and a considerable body of publications has been privately printed, yet to the writer's knowledge there is not as yet any definite plan for official State publications relating to any of these units.

With regard to the agencies directing the publication of unit histories, it seems true that this work is not considered so purely a duty of the adjutants general as are the individual service records. And it is to be hoped that adequate historical supervision and editorship will be retained in each State over the preparation and publication of such unit histories.

The regularly established or specially created historical bodies in the several States have taken as their peculiar field the collection, compilation, and in some cases, the publication of matter relating to the internal history of the State in war time. As Mr. Singewald has pointed out, these bodies have principally bent their energies to collecting material, and few of them are ready to-day to announce plans for publication. This reluctance may be due partly to the present incomplete character of their collections, partly to the absence of available funds for editorial purposes, partly to the lack of the "leave to print" which is given to most of the regularly constituted State departments, and partly to the unwillingness of legislatures to commit the States to a regular plan of war history publications. To these reasons may be added an indifference to the history of the war which we have all found to exist in many quarters.

The State Historical Society of Iowa, with its funds for publication, its ability to secure trained investigators and writers, and its determination to collect, compile, and publish, is more favorably situated than any other State. Within the last month it has issued the first of its Iowa Chronicles of the World War, a volume upon Welfare Campaigns in Iowa, by M. L. Hansen. Four other manuscripts are ready for the printer: Welfare Work in Iowa, The Red Cross in Iowa, The United States Food Adminstration in Iowa, and The Sale of War Bonds in Iowa. The topics selected for this series will follow in a general way the subjects proposed in the Tentative Outline For a State War History; but no set order will be adhered to, and modifications may be made from time to time.

Other definite plans for publication include a manuscript already completed for the Indiana Historical Commission upon the history of the five Liberty loans in Indiana, and two volumes proposed by the war records section of the Illinois State Historical Library, dealing respectively with "Statistics relating to Illinois and the war" and "Documents relating to Illinois and the war."

More indefinite projects or simply suggestions are as follows: New York, a three-volume work, including general material under subject headings, and material arranged by counties, towns, incorporated villages and cities throughout the State outside of New York City. Minnesota, an eight-volume history, including three devoted to a roster, two to military matters, one to material resources, one to home defense and civilian morale, and one a "narrative summary of the whole story."

Maryland, three volumes—one to be a roster, one military history, and one the record of nonmilitary activities.

From these facts concerning actual plans for publication certain deductions are possible.

1. Owing to the character of the records and their deposition in the offices of the adjutants general of the several States it seems logical that the preparation and publication of individual service records should be left in the hands of these officials. This is particularly true in the larger States, where a very extensive force and great expenditure of money will be necessary before publication can be completed.

2. There may be some competition between the State adjutants general and the State historical bodies with reference to the compilation and publication of unit histories in which the State is interested. Such histories should be prepared and edited in the light of the best historical scholarship. A wealth of information is now, or soon will be, at the disposal of historical scholars for the preparation of such histories. Whether the actual work of publication is done by the adjutants general or by purely historical bodies, there ought to be cooperation in order to secure an historically accurate account. Such unit histories should, of course, be well illustrated with photographs and maps.

3. The histories of civilian activities require research skill of the highest character, including the ability to use with discrimination newspapers, current correspondence, and personal reminiscences. Such work can best be directed by regularly established historical organizations.

4. Omitting from our view individual service records, the following is presented as an outline for a State's war history in moderate compass.

Military and naval participation of the State, including the history of units in which the State is most interested; the history of the preparation and organization of the selective-service machinery; and the United States camps and other establishments within the State limits.

Economic participation in the war, including agriculture and food production, industries, transportation and communication, war finance, trade and commerce.

Civilian welfare and morale work, including financial campaigns for welfare work, the actual conduct of welfare work, the war activities of professional classes, educational organizations, religious bodies, and means for maintaining public morale through the press, patriotic organizations, and other means.

A summary in one volume containing a general review of the State's contributions to the victory of the country.

Such an analysis can readily be extended by larger States into a considerable series of volumes, while in the smaller communities it could be placed in three or four volumes.

The paper presented by Mr. Joseph Schafer, of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, dealt with the subject of "Coordination of historical societies within the State." He told of cooperation in Wisconsin between the State Historical Society of Wisconsin and the county and other local agencies, by which the State is being mapped out and subjected to an intensive historical survey particularly along the line of settlement and land tenure, a project frequently referred to as the Wisconsin Domesday Book. This topic has been discussed in print by Mr. Schafer in the Wisconsin Magazine of History for September and December, 1920, and a third paper will be published by the Minnesota Historical Society.

Mr. Worthington C. Ford, of the Massachusetts Historical Society, opened the discussion. He said that there was little to discuss in the propositions so clearly laid down by the speakers. The plans and methods described seemed pertinent and adequate, worthy of trial and application. The conditions of historical societies in the East and the West were different, too different to be brought into a common rule. In the West the State historical society is the model, but in the East the private society, incorporated but not aided by the State, still prevails. There are also the questions of age and opportunity. The account given by Mr. Schafer of material permitting the history of almost every acre in his State from its first survey to be related made the mouth water, for there is no such material in the older communities. In Massachusetts, for example, grants were made to townships and to individuals, but in such general terms as to defy exact description or location. Then, too, the history of the eastern conmunities has become fixed in the local history of more than half a century ago, ponderous volumes, compiled on no method, by writers inexperienced in historical presentation, and intended to laud the town and its people irrespective of its relative importance among the towns of the State or section. Such volumes are distinguished rather by what they omit than what they contain; and the same dreary details, crudely thrown together and connected by little sequence or relation, have made that form of history distasteful. Later came commercialized history, compiled for personal reasons and made possible by those willing to pay for notice which they could have in no other way. Professor Turner has shown in his "Frontier in American History" how negligible for historical purposes the State boundaries are; they rather confuse, if observed, for being artificial they do not mean distinctions in race, territory, or natural conditions. So the eastern town history indicates little of the general questions of institutions, people, or economy. Genealogy is not

race; a farm is not apt to be a type; and a township is not a national unit unless historically treated by a master. I except two works which can well be taken as examples of what local history can be: Three Episodes of New England History, by Charles Francis Adams, and The History of the Town of Southampton (N. Y.) by James Truslow Adams.

In Massachusetts alone there are more than 300 societies engaged in collecting or in handling historical material. Hardly a town of size is without its historical society, busily engaged in collecting what it can, and eager to prove its right to exist by a publication, more or less occasional, and naturally of widely varying merit. In the wish to introduce some method into this active ferment, the Bay State League of Historical Societies was formed and now welcomes at stated times in the year delegates from the 75 societies that have become members. Historical pilgrimages to various towns, a light spread, a paper of not too solid content, and social intercourse serve to create a spirit of solidarity, and it is hoped this spirit will be developed further so as to give the means of directing local activities and even of controlling publications. This would prevent the duplication of publication, waste of funds in printing the trivial or unimportant, and introduce better and more uniform practices in preparing material for the press. At present the high cost of printing acts as a safety valve, checking a natural tendency to print merely for the sake of printing.

The favorable drift of societies toward combination and union has been somewhat modified, if not checked, by the World War. Formerly each society gathered its books and manuscripts of local origin and had a modest museum containing subjects few in number but clothed with local interest and with pertinency to the real objects of a museum. Each town could show something different from what could be seen elsewhere. Owing to the war these little collections have been swamped by war relics and become "standardized." But a German helmet, fragment of a shell, a gun or war medal has little pertinency to local or State history. The effect has been to revivify local phases of history. Each town, institution, or company is intent upon getting what may tend to glorify its part in the war. This has always been the effect of war—to cultivate the local historical interest. What is wanted is to encourage progress toward general history. Mr. Ford doubted if this could be accomplished for some years, so strong had the local feeling become. Each State, town, and institution must get out its "war records" before due attention will be given to general history, and to exert a supervising influence in the East will be difficult. This should not hinder attempts toward that end. A State historical society is in a better situation to accomplish good in control than where the State takes no active part in historical study or in supporting a historical activity;

but it yet remains to be proved that the incorporated society is less efficient in the main lines than a State organization, and it is less under direction, less easily influenced.

The secretary of the conference urged the importance and value of federation of historical agencies within each State and Province of the United States and Canada. Mrs. Albert Sioussat, of the National Society of Colonial Dames, and Mr. George S. Godard, of Connecticut, commented on the subject of the relation of patriotic societies to such federations. Mr. Godard mentioned the work which such societies had done in listing the old homes of the early Connecticut settlers. Mr. James Sullivan spoke on the forms which such cooperation had taken in the State of New York in regional leagues of local historical societies. He called attention to the Federation of Historical Societies of the Genesee County in the western part of New York State; the Mohawk Valley Historical Association, which is a league of all of the local historical societies in the Mohawk Valley; and the contemplated leagues such as were being planned in Long Island, the lower and upper Hudson valleys, the Champlain district, and the like.

IV. CONFERENCE ON ECONOMIC HISTORY

Washington, December 29, 1920

CONFERENCE ON ECONOMIC HISTORY

NOTE.—This conference was held after a luncheon at the New Ebbitt Hotel on Wednesday, December 29, 1920. It afforded several brief papers and an abstract which are sufficiently significant to be included in the printed records of the association.

THE RECOGNITION OF ECONOMIC HISTORY AS A DISTINCT SUBJECT

By CLIVE DAY

Economic history first received prominent recognition as a distinct subject in this country in 1892, when W. J. Ashley was called to Harvard and given the title of professor of economic history.

An examination of the prospectus of courses of American colleges and universities 10 years later, which was far from covering the whole field, but included most of the institutions of prominence, showed that courses in economic history were offered in 43 institutions. As a rule a single course was given combining the economic history of England and of the United States. Sometimes the economic history of those countries was treated separately, and occasionally a course was offered on some special aspect of economic history—commerce, colonization, or industry. The total number of courses given was 68.

An examination of the announcements of these same institutions in 1920 showed that 9 had dropped the course in economic history. The total number of courses given in the subject was 73. The increase in the courses given had not kept pace with the increase in courses given in other subjects.

There are indications, however, that the attention given to economic history had increased not only absolutely but relatively. Courses which do not bear the title economic history include a consideration of the subject. Notably is this true of courses given in the department of history, according to the description of these courses given in the prospectus.

Economic history, if we can trust this evidence, is being studied more extensively than ever, but it is being studied in connection with other subjects, with which it is fused. The indications that it is being absorbed by other subjects raises the question whether it does or does not deserve recognition as a distinct subject.

In elementary instruction I believe the prevailing tendency is wholesome and should be encouraged. Students should be introduced to an understanding of economic development by a study

of economic facts in relation to facts of another kind but of the same time and place. The divorce of economic and political history has been harmful to both.

At a certain stage in the course of instruction the need arises for specialization, and then the study of economic history by itself is profitable and should be encouraged. In advanced work, courses in this subject offer an opportunity for training in method which can not so effectively be supplied by the study of any other subject.

To the student of economics the work in economic history offers the most effective means to acquire that "historical point of view" which is so intangible as to defy definition, but which is indispensable to any sound work in social science.

To the student of history the work in economic history offers connection with a social science which insists that facts are useful only as they lead to generalizations. Some corrective is needed for the worship of the bare fact, which is apt to be inculcated in some stages of historical training. Some experience should be afforded in those processes of historical synthesis which involve general hypotheses and lead to general formulas. For purposes of this kind, the subject of economic history is peculiarly fitted.

THE FIELD FOR THE TEACHING OF ECONOMIC HISTORY IN COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

By Abbott Payson Usher

Although a number of colleges have separated the teaching of the economic history of the United States from the teaching of the economic history of Europe, it is becoming common to find instruction in economic history divided into two semester courses, concerned respectively with the economic history of England or Europe and with the economic history of the United States. A course in the economic history of the United States is frequently given in institutions which offer no instruction in the economic history of Europe, and at times such a course is offered to undergraduates in colleges which provide excellent facilities for the study of European conditions by graduate students. On the whole, however, the two courses are closely associated, constituting a consecutive year's work.

Economic history makes a wide appeal to the interest of the public at the present time, and this disposition to give more attention to the subject can be utilized if its intrinsic difficulties are not forced on the students. The place of the course in the curriculum will thus depend ultimately upon the purposes and ideals of the instructor—it will become a large and important course if it is not made too severe; it will be a small course pursued by graduates and seniors of high standing if it is given with sumptuous critical scholarship and with equal emphasis upon all the phases of the subject.

Some difficulties can be eliminated by restricting the introductory course in the history of Europe to the period of the Industrial Revolution, leaving all discussion of medieval conditions to the advanced course. This policy has been very generally adopted. But from the larger point of view this is not the best solution of the problem. A course that omits all discussion of conditions prior to 1750 foregoes by necessity all possibility of its largest usefulness. The contrast between modern and medieval conditions is the most stimulating interpretative material in the field of economic history, and, if we were to presume that introductory courses should be dominated by general interpretative problems, it would be essential to treat the Middle Ages at sufficient length to bring out the chief features of difference between the social organization of that period and modern times. The public and the general student body are concerned with economic history only in so far as it bears significantly upon the judgment of the large issues of social organization raised by the radical groups. There is in economic history so little of the dramatic and heroic interest that we can not wisely compete with political and military history in those appeals. Our strongest claim lies in the field of social philosophy. We must emphasize what Professor Farnam called the laboratory facilities afforded by history to the social sciences. Economic history can throw light upon the worth of our existing social institutions, both by affording better appreciation of the existing structure and by stimulating comparison with other possible orderings of society. The appeal made to history by the socialists, too, places us under special obligations to deal critically with the large generalizations that have become current through socialistic efforts. Economic history, like all history, is not primarily a bare record of ascertained fact, but primarily a way of thinking about society. The mass of careful, critical work leads to conclusions and interpretations, and it would seem that in the end it will prove to be more important to make these results widely known than to teach the beginning class the factual detail of the recent period.

In so far as difficulties must be eliminated it is perhaps better to omit the harder features of the subject than to omit entirely a period like the Middle Ages. Many features of the economic history of the Middle Ages could not be presented with success in an introductory undergraduate course. Much in the history of commerce and agriculture must be omitted, but the general outlines of the industrial organization of that period can be presented effectively—some appreciation of these generalities is, indeed, essential to any thorough treatment of the Industrial Revolution. The predominant interest to-day in industry, rather than agriculture or commerce, makes it easier to attract the students to a study of industrial history than to economic

history in general. Division of the material by topics rather than by periods would thus strengthen the introductory course and add to its importance in the college curriculum.

Within the last few years economic history has become an important subject in the curricula of business schools, more especially of the undergraduate schools. The function of the course is complex; it serves in part as general training of frankly nonvocational character, in part as grounding in facts and methods of direct vocational significance. The course is very closely related to the work in marketing, commercial geography, and business organization. It takes the place of the course in freshman history in the arts college, as there is seldom time for a purely general course in history. The students are correspondingly less developed than the average college students who elect the work in economic history. Much general training in methods of work must thus be done in connection with this course, and, like the course in freshman history, this becomes inevitably one of the purposes of the course.

The work of the first term in the history of England and Europe differs little from work that might be offered in any arts college, but we are planning at Boston to coordinate the work on the history of the United States with the work in marketing and some of the other special courses offered by the department. Much of the general description of the various industries can be presented in the course on economic history, leaving more time for the discussion of merchandizing problems in the course on marketing. The work in railroads and tariff problems can likewise be made more advanced by careful presentation of the historical background of the current issues. In both courses the students are given training in the handling of simple statistical material by graphic methods, using both arithmetic and the logarithmic scales.

In view of the rapid increase in the registration of the business schools, these required courses in economic or commercial history are becoming numerically more important than the somewhat more advanced courses in the arts colleges. They are thus the outstanding feature of the recent expansion of the field for the teaching of economic history, and it is likely that they may serve to emphasize the opportunity that lies before such elementary courses. The development of this work in the colleges has been influenced by the belief that it must needs be severe; it would seem that severity is not inevitable and unescapable.

The secondary and especially the vocational schools present a possible field, but the policy of extending instruction in economic history to schools of this grade can hardly be deemed well established in fact or theory. The benefits derived from the teaching of economic theory in the secondary schools are dubious, and economic history

ought to be classed with theory in connection with the problem of pedagogy. Some teachers have, no doubt, achieved success with economic history in the secondary schools. But is this subject really as important to these students as the subjects which it must displace wholly or in part? More instruction in language might be given, more instruction in geography, science, or mathematics. It is a delicate question, and it is perhaps less important now to reach a conclusion than to stimulate thorough discussion. I doubt the possibility of teaching the distinctive generalizations of economic history to the pupils of the secondary schools. It is not necessary to teach annals by memory processes as in the case of our national history, and for this reason there is no proper parallel between the claims of political and economic history for a place in the school curriculum. It may be that the secondary school should equip its students with a mature philosophy of life, as Mr. Wells suggests in his New Macchiavelli, but when we consider the modest attainments of our college graduates there is little to encourage us in any struggle toward such an ideal.

FIELDS OF RESEARCH IN ECONOMIC HISTORY: LABOR

By Frank T. Carlton.

Omitting from the classification such revolutionary organizations as the Industrial Workers of the World and the Workers' International Industrial Union, American labor organizations may be classed under two groups: the old-line trade or craft union and the new unionism of the industrial type. To the right of the first group are such organizations as the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the International Typographical Union; to the left of the latter group is the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. Certain amalgamated organizations—of which the remodeled Brewery Workers, now called the Brewery, Flour, Cereal and Soft Drink Workers, is an example—lie in the borderland between the two groups.

In the judgment of the writer, the most important piece of research in labor history now awaiting exploitation is that of tracing carefully the development of the philosophy, strategy, and structure of typical representatives of the two classes of labor organizations; such, for example, as the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, the United Mine Workers, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the International Molders' Union, and the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners. What were the conditions and incident forces which evolved the policies and programs for which the conservative trade-unions stand? Why have these organizations stood firmly for the policy of business unionism, of immediate gains, and of little emphasis upon farsightedness?

Again, what are the other types of influences which have produced such powerful industrial unions as the United Mine Workers and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers? Do differences in ideals and methods of strong labor organizations develop out of differences in the industrial environment, in the use of machinery, in the relative numbers of recent immigrants in the union, in the type of workers who go into the various industries, or in the character of leadership? What are the fundamental causes of the great variety in union structure and functions? To what extent are the ideals and the strategy of certain well-known conservative unions out of step with the industrial situation of to-day? How far do they still bear the stamp of the frontier and of small-scale industry?

Studies of specific labor organizations such as are herein approved should be little concerned with dates, strikes, or spectacular details; but these investigations should disclose the play of forces industrial, psychological, and social, which have molded the unions into their present forms and have determined their programs. These studies may also give aid in answering such pertinent questions as: To what extent have industrial conditions in the last few decades cut across or inhibited the fundamental instincts of men? What modifications are feasible which will tend to make industry square with the instinctive inherited mechanism of the human organism? A union of psychology, sociology, and the newer type of historical research which is interested in social forces rather than in chronology is required to obtain the results which are being pointed out as desirable.

And what are the qualifications of the men who are fitted to undertake this work? The investigators, in addition to being students of history and economics, should have a reasonable amount of training in sociology and psychology. They ought not to be out of sympathy with organized labor; but a definite bias in favor of the union element will tend to color their conclusions and impair the usefulness of their results. Obviously, the investigator in this bitterly contested field must be able to take a detached position.

Careful studies, such as these briefly outlined, of a score or more of labor organizations will enable the students of labor problems to speak authoritatively in regard to the desirability of modifications in the practices of employers and employers' associations. Studies of specific organizations will also disclose or aid in disclosing to what extent the unreasonable and antisocial practices of labor unions, such as restriction of output and the closed shop with the closed union, are the products of practices of employers and employers' associations. If, as the writer suspects, these policies are in no small degree the inevitable reaction from the policies of antiunion employers, even the most stiff-necked employer may be forced by educated public opinion to change his tactics.

The highest mission of historical research is to render efficient assistance in clearing away the mists which surround the opening of a new era in human progress. Historical studies of labor organizations will not disclose the future status of industrial relations; but studies of the sort outlined should aid in reducing to a minimum the friction incident to industrial changes, and practically remove the dangerous possibility of revolutionary modifications. May we soon have skilled workers in this fertile and neglected field of economic history.

Only one other suggestion will be offered. The well-known History of Labor in the United States, written by Professor Commons and associates, ends with the year 1896. The history of the quarter of a century, 1896-1921, should now be written in an adequate manner. This 25-year period marks an important epoch in the history of American labor organizations. The significant features of the period have been outlined by the writer in his Organized Labor in American History.

AGRICULTURE AS A FIELD FOR HISTORICAL RESEARCH[1]

By Louis B. Schmidt

The agricultural history of the United States has not received its proportionate share of emphasis in the study of American economic development. The time has come when more attention must be given to this subject if we are to have a well-rounded out history of this country. In this respect English and European historians, who have given due emphasis to the place of agriculture in the history of those countries, may well be emulated.

The reasons for giving special attention to agriculture as a field for historical research in the United States may be stated as follows: (1) Agriculture has always been the fundamental basis of our prosperity. (2) The agricultural history of the United States is indispensable to a correct understanding of much of our political and diplomatic history. (3) It furnishes the background for the study of agricultural economics. (4) It affords an opportunity for the study of the lives and services of eminent men who have had a great influence on our agricultural development. (5) It is essential to the development of a sound and farsighted rural economy.

Among the subjects which this field offers for investigation may be mentioned the history of the public land question; of specific leading agricultural industries; of agriculture in States and larger regions like

[1] Abstract based on a paper entitled "The economic history of American agriculture as a field for study read at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association held in Washington, D. C., in December, 1915. Doctor Schmidt's paper war printed in the Mississippi Valley Historical Review, June, 1916, III, 39-49.

the Middle West; of agricultural commerce and markets; of agricultural labor; of farm machinery; of farmers' organizations; of the relation of the farmer to politics and legislation. It should be emphasized, finally, that the economic history of American agriculture does not constitute a distinct phase of historical research separate from the other fields for historical research which are being considered at this meeting. On the contrary, it is very closely interrelated with these various fields. It constitutes rather, to be specific, a new point of view in American economic development. On this account it should enlist the sympathy of both the historian and the economist.

V. THE ORIGIN OF THE RUSSIAN STATE ON THE DNIEPER

By MIKHAIL ROSTOVTSEV

University of Wisconsin

THE ORIGIN OF THE RUSSIAN STATE ON THE DNIEPER

By Mikhail Rostovtsev

In the ninth century when the Russian annals first begin to give us a systematic record of the Russian people and their princes, Russia appears to us as a well-shaped body, as an organized state, with its own peculiar political, social, and economic structure, and endowed with a high and flourishing civilization. Russia of the ninth century consisted of many important commercial cities, situated partly on the Dnieper and its tributaries, partly in the far north on Lake Ilmen, and partly in the east on the upper Volga. Each of these cities possessed a large territory populated by different Slavonic tribes and had its own self-government, with a popular assembly, a council of the eldest and elected magistrates. For the purpose of defending its flourishing trade the population of each town invited a special body of trained and well-armed warriors, commanded by a prince. To this prince each city intrusted also the task of collecting tribute from the population, and of fulfilling some administrative and judicial duties. These princes with their retinues generally were German, especially Normans, who were called in Russia Varanguians. One of these princes of the ninth century succeeded in uniting under the rule of one dynasty all the Russian cities, and in forming out of them one state, although not a very firmly established one with a capital on the Dnieper—Kiev.

Nothing similar to this kind of federation of large, commercial, self-governing cities, ruled by an invited—i. e., hired—dynasty, existed at that time in western Europe, with her well-known feudal structure. In the history of the formation of the Russian state, all is peculiar and original—the exclusively commercial character of the cities, the great sway of the Russian commerce which reached Constantinople in the south, central Asia, China, and India in the east, and the Baltic and White Sea in the north, the sharp difference between the self-government of the cities and the primitive tribal organization of the country, the contrast between the prehistoric manner of life of the country population and the high standard of civilized life in the cities, and—last but not least—the unparalleled combination of foreign military power and well-organized self-rule in the frame of the same city-state.

All these peculiarities of Russian origins and the appalling differences between Russia and western Europe are still unexplained. Why should Russia begin its evolution with commerce and city life, western Europe with agriculture and the so-called feudal state-estate? What is the reason for Russia's developing the same form of state-estate much later, not earlier than in the thirteenth century, when western Europe had already begun to supercede this form? Why even then had the Russian feudalism assumed peculiar and original forms so dissimilar to the same phenomena in western Europe?

In spite of many attempts made both by Russian and west European scholars to solve this problem, it remains still unsolved. The main reasons for this failure are as follows: It was a mistake to begin the history of Russia with the Russian annals; i. e., with the ninth century; i. e., to confound the history of Russia with the history of the Slavonic race. The history of Russia as an economic and political organism is much more ancient than the first testimonies about the Slavonic race. Russia, as the land, existed much earlier than the ninth century, and formed a part of the civilized world even in the classical period and in the period of migrations. At this epoch the main lines of the future evolution were already definitely shaped. Therefore we must treat the history of Russia not as the history of the Slavonic race, but as the history of the Russian land. I am convinced that if we treat the history of Russia from this point of view, many of the alleged difficulties will disappear at once, and the history of Russia in general will appear before us in an entirely new light. Let me go more into detail and explain from this point of view the political and social structure of the Kievan princedom in the ninth and tenth centuries.

Civilized life in south Russia started much earlier than is generally accepted. Already at the dawn of history, in the so-called prehistoric period, the valleys of the Dnieper, the Don, and the Kuban can not be separated, as regards their civilized life, from the three main focuses of human culture in general; that of Central Asia and the nearer East, that of middle Europe, and especially the Danube Basin, and that of the Mediterranean. In the so-called copper age the valley of Kuban produced a civilization similar to the contemporary civilization of Mesopotamia, Turkestan, and Egypt. At the same epoch a branch of the middle European civilization flourished on the Dnieper. The first steps of cultural development in the Aegean are closely connected with the cultural development on the shores of the Black Sea. The population of the valleys of the Kuban and the Dnieper at this epoch had already begun to develop a settled agricultural life, and its first large townlike settlements date from the same period. The same period witnessed also the formation of the great commercial highways leading to Russia, the caravan road from Central

Asia to the mouth of the Don and to the Azov Sea, the maritime way along the shores of the Black Sea to the shores both Asiatic and European of the Aegean, and the great riverway from the Black to the Baltic Sea, the way of the amber trade.

The first millennium B. C. was a great epoch in the history of Russia. At this time both civilized life and international commerce took firm root in south Russia. To this phenomenon the existence on the shores of the Black Sea of two well-organized and centralized states, both of Indo-European origin, largely contributed. I mean the Thraco-Cimmerian state in the tenth and ninth centuries, B. C., and the Irano-Scythian state in the eighth to the third centuries, B. C. The very existence of these states in south Russia attracted to the shores of the Black Sea the main bearers of civilized life of this time—the Greeks; and thus Russia became connected by evermore solid ties to the cradle of western European civilization—the shores of the Aegean. Exceedingly intensive was civilized life in south Russia during the long existence of the great Scythian state—the minor brother of the Persian world monarchy. This state succeeded in evolving a highly developed military organization, comparable to that of the Spartan state, and thus in uniting under its power all the tribes between the Volga and the Danube by securing to these tribes the full possibility of developing their economic production and an ever-increasing opportunity of selling the products of their economic activity through the intermediary of the Greek colonies on the Black Sea to the Greek world. Grains, fish, and hides were supplied by the partly settled, partly nomadic population of the south Russian steppes. The great Russian rivers brought to the Greek harbors enormous quantities of valuable furs (beavers, sables, etc.), honey and wax, products of the forest industries of the Finnish hunters in central and northern Russia. The caravan trade of Central Asia carried to the mouths of the Don and the Kuban precious metals and stones from the Orient. As a result of the multisecular existence of the Scythian state and of the ever-increasing exchange of goods between Russia and Greece, settled life took firm root on the banks of the great Russian rivers and spread evermore toward the north. The archæological investigations in the valleys of the Dnieper and the Don showed that in both regions the ancient prehistoric settlements developed into important fortified cities, certainly big centers of commerce. While on the mouths of the Russian rivers these settlements were due to the Greek initiative, the large cities on the middle courses were of purely native origin. It is noteworthy that most of these towns are situated in the region which later became the center of the Dnieper-Russia, in the actual provinces of Kiev, Poltava, and Chernigov, on the rivers Dnieper, Desna, Sula, and Psiol. I have every reason to suppose that the main cities of the Dnieper-Russia—Kiev, Chernigov, Pereiaslavl—

developed out of these ancient native settlements. No one of the above-mentioned towns has been systematically investigated. But their large cemeteries, carefully excavated, yielded enormous quantities of precious gold and silver objects, of valuable pieces of furniture, of amphoræ full of wine and oil, all these showing that the prosperity of these cities depended entirely on their trade, which of course assumed the forms of barter, as no Greek or Oriental coins were ever found in the graves.

The Scythians were replaced in the prairies of south Russia, beginning with the third century, B. C., by a sequence of Sarmatian tribes, of the same Iranian stock. They succeeded with the help of some Thracian and Celtic tribes which invaded south Russia from the west, in destroying the mighty Scythian state, but they did not succeed in forming in its place their own united state. They remained divided into different tribes, which constantly moved to the west until they were stopped at the threshold of the mighty Roman Empire. But their appearance in south Russia did not change the whole aspect of life there. Like the Scythians, the Sarmatians understood the importance of keeping alive the international trade and of protecting the big commercial cities, both Greek and native, on the shores of the Black Sea and on the banks of the Russian rivers. But the destruction of the Scythian united state and the substitution for it of many comparatively week tribal formations had a far-reaching influence on the development of Russia. It opened the doors of south Russia to the western neighbors—the Celtic and German tribes. The former of course only hooked on to Russia in their movement toward the rich regions of the Balkan Peninsular and Asia Minor. But the Germans who followed them later on—especially beginning with the first century, B. C.—met with different conditions. Their movement toward the south and the west was barred by the strong legions of the Roman Empire and was stopped at the very threshold of the civilized world, on the line of the Rine and Danube. The only way for their southward expansion was therefore the old commercial way of the Dnieper. Consequently German tribes from the north and the west gradually poured into south Russia and occupied one place after another. This is shown with full evidence by the substitution in south Russia of the Scythian and Sarmatian graves by graves of quite different forms and content identical with graves of the German tribes. But we have no reason whatever to suppose that the German invaders radically changed the whole aspect of life in south Russia. Their graves are of course poorer than those of the Scythians and Sarmatians. But they also are full of products of classical art and industry, and moreover we often find in these graves Roman silver and gold coins. We must not forget that the German tribes in their native country were in constant trade relations with the Roman lands and became accus-

tomed to their system of exchange based on money. No wonder if beginning with the first century, A. D., treasures of Roman coins are of constant occurrence on all the Russian river ways as far as the Baltic shore, and that products of Roman industries and Roman coins penetrated on the same ways as far as the western slopes of the Ural Mountains and the steppes of western Siberia. It is evident therefore that the Germans took over the ancient commercial relations, and even that they developed these relations in teaching the German merchants in Scandinavia and eastern Germany to use as one of the main ways of their trade the system of the Russian rivers. We have no ground, either, to suppose that the Germans destroyed the city life on the Dnieper. They needed these cities as much as their predecessors. I am rather inclined to think that they developed this city life and created new trade centers, especially in the north. Novgorod on the Ilmen, for example, had perhaps this origin.

In the light of this constant filtering of the German tribes into Russia we may better understand the so-called Gothic invasion of Russia in the third century, A. D. It was only the logical consequence of a long process. In the third century the Germans finally reached the shores of the Black Sea and succeeded in unitiug all the German tribes in Russia into one state under the leadership of two mighty tribes—the Visigoths and the Ostrogoths. But on these shores they did not destroy either commerce or civilized life. Of course, they burned down Olbia, but they kept the more important Panticapæum, and used it as the starting point for their commerce and military expeditions against the Roman Empire.

The Germans—warriors and keen sailors—were always attracted by the wealth of the Roman Empire. As soon as they felt that the mighty organism of the empire in the critical period of the third century began to weaken and to disintegrate, they renewed their attacks on the Roman Provinces. The weakest point in the Roman Empire was, of course, the Danube frontier, long and difficult as it was, without a civilized hinterland. But to surmount the superstitious fear of the Germans before the legions of Rome, then supposed to be invincible, and to transform scattered attacks into a mighty movement, a strong push from behind was needed. This shock was given to the German tribes in Russia by the first Mongolian invaders of Europe—the mighty Huns. Under their pressure, a part of the German and Iranian tribes with whom the Germans lived in a kind of federation—the Visigoths and the Alains—rushed first into the Roman Empire. The results are well known and I need not review them. Soon after, the Huns themselves, under Attila, dragging with them the Ostrogoths, the Alains, and scores of Germanic and Iranian tribes, followed the victorious march of their predecessors. I do not need to elaborate this point.

The results of these events were of the utmost importance for Russia. In the fifth and sixth centuries Russia was swept clean of her German, Iranian, and Mongolian rulers and inhabitants. Small splinters of the Alains remained on the Kuban, where they still dwell under the name of Ossetes. Some tribes of the Goths still occupied a part of the Crimea and of the Tauric Peninsula. Scattered hordes of Huns came back, after their disaster, to the Russian steppes. But no one of these splinters played any part in the future destinies of Russia. The place of the Germans soon was occupied by a new European people—the Slavs. They dwelt originally—as far as our knowledge reaches—on the northern slopes of the Carpathians toward the Vistula and the Baltic Sea. According to Ptolemy and to Jordanes they were well known to the Romans and were divided in three parts—the Veneds, the Sclavenes, and the Antes. During the domination of the Goths in south Russia they were vanquished by them and formed a part of the Gothic Empire and endured a kind of vassalage. But in the sixth century the same Jordanes, a Goth himself who knew very well the conditions of northeastern Europe, knew likewise of the continuous settlements on the Dnieper and of the occupation of the steppes as far as the Black Sea. It is evident, therefore, that the Slavs repeated the movement of the Germans and replaced them in south Russia. Thus they founded in south Russia a state of the same type as the Germans before them and naturally inherited from them their towns, their trade relations, and their civilization. This civilization was of course not a German civilization, but the ancient Greco-Iranian civilization of the Scythians and the Sarmatians with slight modifications. At the very dawn of their life in south Russia they were threatened by a great danger. New conquerors of the same stock as the Huns—the Avars—tried to swallow them and to drag them into western Europe. But the new Slavonic federation was strong enough to repulse this attack and to annihilate the Avars. Thence the old Russian saying preserved to us by our annals: "They perished like the Avars."

The Slavs took firm root on the Dnieper and spread widely to the north and to the east, occupying all the old highways of commerce. In the north they developed Novgorod, in the east they founded Rostov, in the south—opposite Panticapæum—Tmutarakan. The conditions were favorable for them. Their ancient relations with the Germans secured to them the military help of wandering Norman chieftains, who were prepared to serve and to fight for anybody, provided that they had good opportunities to enrich themselves. The Germans helped the Slavs to find the ancient way to Constantinople and to protect their trade fleet on the Dnieper. The domination in the south of the new rulers on the Volga—the Mongolian tribe of the Khazars—a peaceful domination of a trading people,

guaranteed for them the oriental market. So they grew strong and rich and developed a lively trade with the German north, the Finnish northeast, the Arabic southeast, and especially with the Byzantine south. This trade was, as before, the main source of their civilization and their wealth, and dictated to them the forms of their political and social life. Their centers were, as before, the great cities on the Dnieper, and the most important of these cities was, of course, Kiev, thanks to her wonderful geographic situation in the middle of the Dnieper Basin, just midway between the Baltic and the Black Seas.

History knows of no pauses and interruptions in its evolution. Nor are there any in the history of Russia. The Slavonic is one of the epochs in the evolution of Russia as such. But the Slavonic race succeeded in accomplishing one cardinal thing, which neither the Iranians nor the Germans could or wanted to achieve. For the Iranians and the Germans, Russia was an expedient to achieve their main aim, the conquest of western Europe. For the Slavs, Russia was their final aim and became their country. They bound themselves forever to the country, and to them, of course, Russia is indebted not only for her name but also for her peculiar statehood and civilization.

VI. RECENT REALIGNMENT IN THE HISTORY OF MEDIEVAL MEDICINE AND SCIENCE

FIELDING H. GARRISON, M. D.
Surgeon General's Office
Washington, D. C.

RECENT REALIGNMENT IN THE HISTORY OF MEDIEVAL MEDICINE AND SCIENCE

By Fielding H. Garrison, M. D.

Up to the beginning of the twentieth century it was assumed by most historians that science was persecuted and suppressed during the Middle Ages. This was due in part to religious prepossessions, to the aversion to dogmatic theology which sprang up under the liberal teachings of Darwin and Huxley, to the tendency of the human mind to follow tradition, but more particularly to ignorance of the basic documents and their content. Until recently little was known of the contents of the earlier printed books on science, and the scientific manuscripts were practically unknown. Intensive study of the older writings has been the order of the later period, and the manuscripts are now in process of being photographed, catalogued, collated, and studied. It is now taken for granted that the Middle Ages were a period of race absorption and formation of new nations, a period in which the popular mind was paralyzed by the long succession of wars following the downfall of the Roman Empire, in which, as in Russia to-day, life was endangered by the aggressions of wandering outlawry and in which the only stabilizing powers and protectors of learning were the church and the state. In the earlier centuries of the Middle Ages Greek thought was moribund, while western European culture underwent a long process of Latinization, followed by a period of Arabic domination; that is, of Greek culture filtered through Arabic translations, prior to the extensive circulation of the actual Greek texts after the invention of printing. The effect of this Latinizing process upon medicine was peculiar. In the first century of the Christian era the Roman and also the Greek physicians living in Rome began to make huge compilations or encyclopedias of everything known about medicine. We need only mention Celsus, Pliny, Galen, Aretæus, Soranus, and Dioscorides. This tradition was maintained by the Byzantine writers of the sixth and seventh centuries A. D., and was carried straight into the Renaissance period and beyond it. The effect was to make internal medicine a matter of cut and dried doctrine as to theory, and of tradition as to practice. The big books on practice were excellently arranged, divided into chapters and even indexed, but, short of a few original observations, contained

little that was not already known. Meanwhile the traditions of rational bedside practice, derived from the Greeks, was maintained at a solitary outpost of Greek culture, the medical school at Salerno. Little was known of medieval anatomy until Sudhoff exhumed, photographed, and published the manuscripts and manuscript illustrations. His findings go to show that the earlier medieval anatomists were, in the main, blind followers of tradition, their descriptions being often based upon the earlier dissections of apes and swine, their illustrations servile copies of crude diagrams which originated, perhaps in the Orient, hundreds of years before. Just before the Renaissance period, as Streeter has shown, the Florentine painters made more dissections and did better anatomical illustration than the professional anatomists themselves. Modern anatomy began with the wonderful hand drawings of Leonardo da Vinci (1510) and the textbook of Vesalius (1543). There was no physiology to speak of between Galen and Harvey. The medieval physicians, then, were weak in anatomy and physiology, and not particularly remarkable in internal medicine. Their main accomplishment was in surgery and public hygiene. Of surgeons there were two classes—the educated, scientific surgeons like Roger, Roland, Hugh, Theodoric, Saliceto, Lanfranc, and Guy de Chauliac, who were protected by prince and prelate; and the wandering outcast surgeons, who operated for cateract, hernia, and stone, and sometimes cast discredit upon the guild by malpractice. Hugh, Theodoric, and Mondeville taught the principles of aseptic surgery, as originally stated by Hippocrates. Guy discredited it. The medieval surgeons used sleeping draughts or anæsthetic inhalations, and their operative skill was considerable. Saliceto knew of suture of nerves and intestines, crepitus in fractures, renal dropsy, venereal contagion, and used mercurial salves and prophylactic ablutions. The many manuscript pictures of surgical practice which have been published by Giacosa, Sudhoff, van Leersum, and others give us a good notion of medieval procedure and etiquette, and from the number of them we can surmise the amount of operating which was done in spite of the many interdictions. In the Renaissance period, due to the development of didactic anatomy by Vesalius, surgery made even greater advances, culminating in the work of Paré.

Adequate knowledge of public medicine in the Middle Ages is of recent date, and is based upon the exhumation, collation, and publication of unprinted public documents and manuscripts, mainly by Sudhoff and his pupils. The development of universities by the state; of hospitals, nursing, and charitable care of the sick by the church; the model law of Frederick II for the regulation of medical practice (1224), were known to earlier historians. Sudhoff has exhumed and published a great number of sanitary ordinances, and fugi-

tive tracts on syphilis, plague, and leprosy, showing the efforts made to prevent these diseases, and the interdiction of the adulteration of food, the sale of poisons, the accumulation of refuse, etc. The Mosaic principle of isolation of diseases thought to be contagious was extended in a city ordinance of Basel (1350) to eight diseases, viz, plague, phthisis, scabies, erysipelas, leprosy, anthrax, trachoma, and epilepsy. Through the severe and rigorous isolation of lepers, leprosy was ultimately stamped out. Quarantine of ships against bubonic plague was first instituted by the Venetian Republic (1374); detention for a month was practiced at Ragusa (1377), and this *trentina* was extended to a *quarantina* (40 days) at Marseille (1383) and applied to infected areas by Venice in 1403. The investigations of early public health documents and tracts on syphilis by Sudhoff go to show that the disease was already known in the time of Columbus and that civil authority was making efforts to prevent its spread. We have to reflect that the Greeks had no definite knowledge or theory of contagion, combating major epidemics not by isolation of patients but by prayers and sacrifices to angered gods. This knowledge came from the Hebrews, and is clearly stated in Leviticus (XIII–XV) and elsewhere in the Bible. The isolation of epileptics, and the existence of an isolation hospital for epileptics at Rufach (Upper Alsace) as late as 1486, was a solitary survival of the Assyro-Babylonian doctrine that the disease is contagious, and of the ancient Greek theory that the major neuroses were in the nature of "miasms" or stains cast upon the soul by the infernal (chthonian) gods, which was ridiculed in the Hippocratic writing "On the Sacred Disease."

As Allbutt has shown, theoretical science was much hampered in the Middle Ages through the opposition between Realists who believed that all things proceed from God (Theism), and Nominalists who maintained that God exists in all things (Pantheism). This opposition led to persecution of freethinkers, tended to make all reasoning deductive, and held but little encouragement to followers of induction and experiment. But such practical inventions as printing, gunpowder, the mariner's compass, astronomical tables, spectacle lenses, and sundry devices in operative surgery were immediately taken up, and it is to this tendency to evaluate an investigation, discovery, or invention by its practical bearings that we owe the development of modern experimental or laboratory science. The medieval physicians devised most of the school arithmetic and grammars of the period. The association of physicians, painters, and apothecaries in the same guild led to the interest of the artists in practical anatomy and made extensive dissecting possible (Streeter). Vesalius and Harvey gained ground through the practical importance of their work; and, in a

later period, even such a complex phase of mathematics as the theory of differential equations was developed to solve problems in mechanics and physics. The best phases of medieval science—invention, sanitation, surgery—were away from bald theorizing and in the direction of the practical. The keynote of modern scientific education is that chemistry and physics are best taught in the laboratory, anatomy in the dissecting room, pathology in the deadhouse, surgery in the operating theater, internal medicine in the clinic and at the bedside. Science, as Woodward has said, actually thrives by opposition. This phase of medieval science, the dying out of ancient culture, the development of practical handcraft and redecraft, has been defined by Singer as "the pathology and embryology of human thought."

The status of the scholastic literature of the Middle Ages was never better stated than by Doctor Johnson in his Tour of the Hebrides:

> Learning was then rising on the world; but ages so long accustomed to darkness were too much dazzled with its light to see anything distinctly. The first race of scholars in the fifteenth century, and some time after, were, for the most part, learning to speak rather than to think, and were, therefore, more studious of elegance than of truth. The contemporaries of Boethius thought it sufficient to know what the ancients had delivered. The examination of tenets and of facts was reserved for another generation.

This critical examination and study of documents, begun by the medical philologists of the Renaissance period, is now going forward. While the most important medical texts of classical antiquity and the Middle Ages were issued in type by the Renaissance printers, much of the scientific and medical literature of the time remained in the category of "published not printed," i. e., circulated in manuscript. Mrs. Dorothea Waley Singer has catalogued and classified no less than 30,000 scientific manuscripts of the Middle Ages in England alone, and of these, 15,000 are medical. This will give some idea of the enormous amount of scientific literature existing in the Middle Ages, and little of this has been examined to date. Sudhoff has devoted most of his life to the photography, study, and publication of medieval medical manuscripts and manuscript illustrations found in libraries, monasteries, palaces, and elsewhere on the continent of Europe. By collation and comparison of these, he has been able to alter many facts and dates, e. g., the determination of the approximate date of the famous *Regimen sanitatis* of Salerno, by using some 80 manuscripts of the poem as controls. In the textual study of medieval medicine, those who have done most are Choulant, Haeser, Pagel, Sudhoff, Neuburger, Nicaise, Wickersheimer, and Singer. In the United States only two physicians have thus far devoted much attention to this phase of medieval medicine, namely, Dr. James J. Walsh (New York) and Dr. Edward C. Streeter (Boston).

VII. LATIN AS AN INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE IN THE MIDDLE AGES

By LOUIS J. PAETOW

University of California

LATIN AS AN INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE IN THE MIDDLE AGES

By Louis J. Paetow

The outstanding feature of general history since the fall of the Roman Empire has been the ascendancy of western Europe. In times to come, when historians shall have discarded the fantastic and illogical division of history into medieval and modern times, they will probably designate the period from the decline of the Roman Empire to the beginning of the Great War in 1914 as the period of the dominance of western Europe. Perhaps the opening of this period will be set about 1100 A. D., for in the formative era from the fifth to the eleventh centuries western Europe was still on the defensive against its many foes, and the world was dominated by the Byzantines and the Mohammedans. But beginning with the first crusade, the west of Europe took the offensive, and ever since has dominated the world of thought and of action.

Medieval western Europe fell heir to two extremely important factors in the ancient Roman Empire—the Roman Catholic Church and the Latin language. In the period from the crusades to the age of oceanic discoveries leadership in the world was secured in western Europe by men who called themselves Latins (*Latini*). In short, modern civilization rests flatly upon the achievements of Latin Christendom.

Latin was the dominant note of the culture of western Europe when it emerged as the mistress of the world. Wherever Roman Christianity penetrated, there the Latin language became the bond of union amalgamating the efforts of the most progressive peoples on the globe. Latin was the international language in the Middle Ages not only among the Romanic and Germanic peoples; it had penetrated far into Slavic lands; it was heard in Iceland and Greenland, and perhaps on the shores of North America; it was widespread in eastern Europe and western Asia in the days when there was a Latin kingdom of Jerusalem and a Latin empire of Constantinople; and it had reached the Pacific Ocean in the oriental bishopric of Peking.

One would naturally suppose that so tremendous an engine for civilization as was Latin in the Middle Ages would have been studied and appraised to the last detail by modern scholarship. But what

do we see? Almost utter neglect. No adequate history of postclassical Latin; very fragmentary histories of its literature; most of its monuments still unedited, or edited badly; and worst of all, in this age of dictionaries and books of reference, no satisfactory dictionaries for those who concern themselves with the Latin writings of medieval and modern times. If Du Cange could appear among us to-day nothing would surprise him more than that his Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimæ latinitatis, written in 1678 and augmented largely in the eighteenth century, is still referred to as the standard dictionary of medieval Latin. Strictly speaking, it is not a dictionary at all, but, as its very title indicates, a glossary of uncommon and technical terms, especially in the domain of politics and law. In many respects it is more a dictionary of medieval antiquities than a true lexicon.

Historians, and medievalists in particular, are much concerned with postclassical Latin and should have a full understanding of its unmerited fate. On the whole, historians have done more than philologists to draw due attention to this form of Latin. Du Cange himself was a historian rather than a linguist. The strange eclipse of medieval Latin in modern times can be understood only when illuminated by the full light of history. Thus the task of awakening interest in the Latin of Latin Christendom should be the joint work of philologists and historians.

Latin was a truly international language in the ancient Roman world. The break-up of the Empire in the fourth and the fifth centuries threatened its total dissolution into a number of Romanic tongues. That danger was averted by the Roman Church. Although Christianity was introduced into western Europe through a Greek medium, by about 400 A. D., western Christendom was thoroughly Latin. St. Augustine could afford to forget the Greek which he had learned as a schoolboy under the master's lash, and St. Jerome sealed the triumph of Latin in the Vulgate. Thus Latin was given a distinctly ecclesiastical stamp and also the stamp of the language of the common people, for Christianity in its earlier stages was a popular religion.

By means of a church which established its center in Rome, the language of ancient Latium was thus preserved as an international language, and soon penetrated into distant woods and swamps of western Europe where the Roman eagles had never been seen.

True, it was not the language of all the inhabitants of western Europe. It was mastered only by the clergy, the learned class, and by others who engaged in international business, including many members of the governing classes and even some merchants. In the early Middle Ages the state of culture was not high enough and the facilities for schooling were so poor that it was impossible to hold the

common people to the Latin of books and international intercourse, and so they were left to develop their vernaculars without help or hindrance. Until about the twelfth century, however, there was practically no writing done in western Europe except in Latin.

It was in this early period that a form of Latin script was developed which rapidly became standard throughout Latin Christendom—the so-called Caroline minuscule. To-day, the use of these letters is well-nigh world-wide. The modern typewriter has done much to make us appreciate the chaste beauty and serviceability of the Caroline minuscule. We usually call it the Roman alphabet, but that is, strictly speaking, a misnomer. If Cæsar could appear among us to-day, he would be unable to read his Commentaries from an ordinary printed edition. Only the capital letters would appear familiar to his eyes. Most of the small letters would perplex him exceedingly. Our alphabet is a medieval Latin product of Carolingian times, originating chiefly in northern France, in that fruitful portion of western Europe which later brought forth Gothic architecture and the medieval university. Bismarck refused to read books printed in "Latin" type, insisting on the Gothic type which he looked upon with national pride as a German product, until it was pointed out to him that the supposedly characteristic German type was merely a survival of a degenerate or baroque form of medieval writing which most of the other nations of Europe had discarded in favor of the Caroline minuscule. This illustrates how seriously the advancement of learning can be hindered by ignorance and prejudice in high places.

The Christian Church thus carried Latin through perilous times. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries it was borne aloft triumphantly by the medieval university movement. Latin naturally became the sole medium of expression in one of the most remarkable intellectual revivals which the world has ever seen. Now Europe witnessed the interesting spectacle of truly international universities—masters and students flocking to the famous centers of learning from all corners of Europe regardless of the vernaculars which were their mother tongues; books written in remote cells of monasteries becoming at once, without translations, common property of the intellectual class throughout western Europe.

Internationalism is put to the hardest test by war. According to a letter of John of Salisbury, dated 1168, King Louis VII of France complained of the German students in Paris who, with grand and boastful phrases, mocked him because he lived like a plain citizen and had none of the barbaric splendors of a tyrant, constantly surrounded by armed guards. Louis VII actually expelled some foreign students, but John of Salisbury considered that action very exceptional in hospitable France, "the kindliest and most civilized of all nations" (*omnium mitissima et civilissima nationum*). The powerful and war-

like Philip Augustus was very tolerant toward students who were alien enemies. The same is true of his great namesake, Philip IV (the Fair). On February 25, 1297, he sent an order to all his justices and ministers to watch with special care over the students in Paris and Orleans who had come from Flanders. War had broken out with the Count of Flanders, and he feared that under this pretext many might be tempted to molest the members of the university who had come from those parts. As long as they conducted themselves properly in France they were to be under the special care of the king; they were allowed to go to Flanders and to return freely, and messengers with money and supplies were to be allowed to pass between them and their homes.[1] A similar order was issued in 1315 by his successor when war had broken out between France and another Count of Flanders.[2]

Thus Latin was acting most effectively as a bond of union in western Europe when the foundations of modern civilization were laid in parliament, in the jury, and in the university. Apparently the question was never raised as to whether Latin should endure as the international language. Men simply took for granted that it always would endure, for its advantages were so obvious. Roger Bacon never dreamed that the day would come when university lectures would be delivered at Paris in French.[3]

In this very cocksure attitude of the men of the medieval universities there lurked great danger for Latin. They used it with the utmost freedom, which bordered on abandon, in expressing the subtlest distinctions in philosophy and theology. Latin was in large measure remade in these institutions of learning and a new epoch opened in the history of the language. We would suppose that one of the foremost branches in medieval universities would have been the study of Latin itself. If we were to develop an international language to-day, it would at once become the object of the most painstaking study to determine its theory and practice. But medieval universities were so engrossed in other things that they paid practically no attention to the study of Latin language and literature. They had a precious jewel and they handled it as if it were a clod.

Let it be remembered, however, that there is an honorable list of men of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries who advocated the study of Latin language and literature and who foretold the evil consequences which would follow neglect. There were those who pleaded for a sympathetic study of the ancient classical masterpieces of Latin, and others who realized that new and improved grammars and hand-

[1] *Chartularium universitatis Parisiensis*, edited by Denifle and Chatelain, II, 75, No. 691.

[2] Ibid., 175, No. 719.

[3] See, e. g., his *Compendium studii*, ed. Brewer. in Fr. Rogeri Bacon *Opera quaedam hactenus inedita*, I (Rolls Series, 15 466), also his *Opus majus*, ed. Bridges, I, 67.

books were necessary to teach Latin in an up-to-date way. It is notorious that for centuries the books of Donatus and Priscian were used to teach medieval Latin to children whose training and mental attitude differed radically from those of the boys for whom these books were written. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries some valiant efforts were made to correct this evil. The most successful new grammatical text was the famous versified *Doctrinale* of Alexander de Villa Dei.

Alexander was an obscure student in Paris who wrote his book in 1199, at the behest of the Bishop of Dol, to tutor his two grandchildren. The grammar is not without its merits, especially in its chapters on syntax, but the astounding thing about it is that so indifferent a book acquired such a wonderful reputation. At least one professor in the University of Paris, John Garland, spent endless efforts in the first half of the thirteenth century decrying the *Doctrinale* or trying to improve it, but to no avail. The sad truth is that the enlightened thirteenth century was satisfied with the *Doctrinale* as a text for teaching Latin. The great medieval universities, which should have fostered the study of their precious international language with utmost care, stultified themselves by resting content with Priscian and the *Doctrinale*.

The inevitable reaction came in the fourteenth century when the Italian humanists turned away from the traditional subjects of the schools and fairly reveled in the study of Latin language and literature in the pages of the ancient classical authors. Laurentius Valla (c. 1406–1457), in his *Elegantiæ linguæ Latinæ*, sounded the keynote of this new era in the history of Latin. For hundreds of years, he said, no one had spoken Latin, no one had even been able to read real Latin. Then he contrasted the sad centuries which failed to produce a single scholar with his own happy generation which had recovered the Roman language and set up as its ideal of intellectual achievement Ciceronian eloquence.

This curse of Valla and his followers darkened the Middle Age for centuries; it utterly blighted medieval Latin which had served so wonderfully as an international language. The humanists believed that they had awakened Latin to a new life. They did reawaken classical Latin and thus did scholarship immeasurable benefit by opening up the ancient world. But by condemning all things medieval without discrimination they killed Latin as a living and international language. It was not long before the vernaculars encroached upon the old precincts of Latin and divided former Latin Christendom into many rival linguistic groups at the very time when it was winning the world by means of oceanic discoveries.

Can Latin come back? Can it once again become an international language such as it was for so many centuries of the world's history? Such a question can not be answered offhand in the negative. It is

too important to be brushed aside; it deserves to be investigated. Ever since the beginning of this century there have come insistent demands that the problem of a world language must be faced squarely. Daily in this age of rapid progress distances are shrinking, old barriers are disappearing, our neighbors are coming closer and growing more numerous, the burden of learning many foreign languages is becoming more and more intolerable. We must devise some means of understanding each other. This great problem has been approached largely in a desultory way by miscellaneous groups often working in a very amateurish and visionary fashion. The great universities and other learned bodies have held themselves aloof from it almost as completely as medieval universities neglected the study of Latin language and literature. The late war interrupted the quest for an international language, but now it has been taken up with renewed vigor. The war itself and the Peace Conference forcibly emphasized the need of a common means of communication.

In July, 1919, the International Research Council, meeting in Brussels, appointed a committee on international auxiliary language. This committee has been very active. At its suggestion the British Association for the Advancement of Science appointed a committee "to study the practicability of an international language." The Modern Language Association of America has appointed a similar committee. The American Classical League has a committee on "Latin as an international language for scientific purposes." The British Classical Association also has a committee.

Is not the time ripe for the American Historical Association to take some action in this matter? Medievalists should be especially anxious to give Latin a proper hearing. Dense shades of ignorance still hang about the history of the Latin language and especially about medieval Latin. Any investigation of this question would redound to the benefit of medieval studies. It is by no means a wild surmise that the Sphinxlike Middle Ages may reveal the answer to the long quest for an international language, for they can teach us by the experience of a time when a practical form of Latin was the international language of Europe among Romanic, Germanic, Slavic, and Magyar peoples.

VIII. THE ENLIGHTENED DESPOTISM

GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER
Wesleyan University

THE ENLIGHTENED DESPOTISM

By George Matthew Dutcher

The most important development in governmental practice on the continent of Europe in the eighteenth century prior to the outbreak of the French Revolution was the enlightened despotism. This movement has sometimes been miscalled the benevolent despotism by those who emphasize certain of the humanitarian reforms which characterized it, without considering the circumstances and motives which lay back of these reforms. In fact, so far as I am aware, writers have hitherto confined their attention to registering certain acts of the enlightened despotism without attempting to analyze that manifestation.

The element which was new in enlightened despotism was not despotism but enlightenment. The word "enlightenment" as used in this connection as well as its German equivalent *aufklärung* signified in a very definite sense rationalism or, more correctly, the recognition of the authority of reason. The philosophical eighteenth century rejected divine right as the foundation of the state in favor of reason—enlightenment as the basic authority. Enlightenment, in this sense, while primarily an intellectual movement, found practical application in the fields of both religion and government. In the field of religion it expressed the reaction against mysticism and pietism. It was represented in England by the Deistic school culminating in Bolingbroke and Hume; in France by Voltaire and the Encyclopedists; in Germany most distinctively by Wolff. This movement did not necessarily limit itself to the ideas propounded by the Deistic group but included various forms of refusal to submit to authority in matters of church and of personal religion. In the relations of state and church it signified the supremacy of the state in all matters not clearly of a spiritual character. In this respect the movement culminated in the suppression of the Society of Jesus in the Catholic lands.

On the side of government the problem appeared in its simplest form in England where the conditions, arising after the Restoration and centering in the Revolution of 1688, developed the theories of nonresistance and of passive obedience. The significance of these theories, which are so puzzling to the present-day mind, is that out of the conflict between king and parliament there came the recogni-

tion of the supremacy of the state quite apart from any individual, even though that individual were the monarch. Even the extreme Tory, Bolingbroke, recognized as the one valid aim the union of all in the service of the state, though he looked to the "patriotic king," not to parliament, for leadership in that union.

In France the development of the movement prior to the Revolution was very largely on the theoretical rather than the practical side, and nowhere was the discussion so broad in its scope or carried with clearer conviction to its logical conclusions. In Germany the result was the reverse of that in England. There, too, the logical development was a recognition of the supremacy of the state, but owing to the lack of properly developed self-governing institutions the leadership in the state was without question vested in the monarch. In Germany, too, thanks to Wolff, the frank and full application of the rationalistic principles to both church and state was most clearly set forth, and, thanks to the practical genius as well as the philosphical instinct of Frederick the Great, it received its most complete demonstration in the enlightened despotism of that prince.

In matters of government the enlightened despotism operated primarily in three fields. The first was in the development of the supremacy of law as a natural correlative to the supremacy of the state. This involved the development of uniformity of law and the consequent movement toward codification, to which Frederick gave particular attention. The second phase was in the tendency toward equality before the law, both of territorial areas and of classes of the population. This movement looked toward centralization and uniformity in administration, and toward the minimizing, if not the abolition, of privilege. The third field was that of administrative efficiency which involved the development of systematic administration, as increased powers came with the progress of centralization in authority. Administration had to respond to the demands and tests of reason by seeing that the government produced for the state the goods which reason approved, especially in matters diplomatic, military, financial, and economic. The characteristic form of administrative system thus developed was bureaucracy. After this brief and inadequate survey or analysis of the enlightened despotism, it is my purpose to undertake to trace not the development of theory, but the practical working out of events which culminated in the enlightened despotism of Frederick the Great and of Maria Theresa and to show how Prussia and Austria, rather than the more advanced nations, England and France, became the birthplace of the enlightened despotism.

In England the civil strife of the Wars of the Roses had wiped out large numbers of the nobility and weakened their power. The Tudor monarchy which rested on the firm basis of popular

support, devised and executed measures which destroyed the last elements of power and privilege of the medieval feudal nobility. These results had been achieved before the religious schism of the Protestant Revolution reached England, so that king and commons were able to carry into effect a series of ecclesiastical reforms which destroyed the ecclesiastics, as a privileged class, with no more serious opposition than such local and spasmodic affairs as the Pilgrimage of Grace, or Ket's Rebellion, or Wyatt's Insurrection, or the Rising of the North. Because the Wars of the Roses had destroyed the possibility of feudal organization and leadership of an opposition, and because of the shrewd policy of national unification of the Tudor monarchs, England escaped the disaster of a series of wars of religion and enjoyed the opportunity for steady political development free from the strife of Catholic and Protestant. England's insularity, furthermore, permitted a policy of political isolation and neutrality so that in Tudor times England kept free from the civil wars of religion in France and in Stuart times from the Thirty Years' War in Germany. The traditional emphasis upon the so-called Tudor absolutism has exalted the success of the royal policy and the growth of monarchical power, but has ignored the no less significant fact of not merely the continued existence, but the steady growth of the power of the commons. From Anglo-Saxon days, moreover, the English people had been accustomed to the practice of local self-government, and the control of local administration was never centralized. While not producing a uniformly effective and perfect system, it did provide one that responded to the popular intelligence and will, and yielded the results the nation required. It trained the citizen in responsibility and afforded scope for his initiative.

In England it naturally came to pass that, after the elimination of feudal privilege in the Wars of the Roses and of ecclesiastical privilege in the Reformation, the commons were able to wage uncomplicated and effective war on royal prerogative in the great Civil War and the Revolution of 1688, and to enter the eighteenth century with England fully and clearly organized as a constitutional monarchy, thoroughly unified and nationalized to participate in the struggle for world empire. Neither royalty nor nobility nor clergy but the commonalty of the realm won for England the splendid triumph sealed by the peace of Paris in 1763.

With this development in England there stand in contrast the contemporary changes and results in France and in the lands on which rested the shadow rather than the yoke of the Holy Roman Empire.

France, in the fifteenth century, emerged victorious from its Hundred Years' War with England and triumphant in the efforts of the royal power against the forces of feudal provincialism; but, without

awaiting the completion of the task of national consolidation, plunged rashly into wars of conquest in Italy and of rivalry with Charles V. Ere those wars were ended the Reformation had come to add ecclesiastical strife and afford the restless nobility an opportunity, through the civil wars of religion, to undermine the royal authority and recover political power for their selfish advantage. Henry IV asserted the principles of religious toleration and of the supremacy of national interests and authority, in order that he and his successors might give themselves to the task of humbling the feudal nobility and of exalting the royal power. The double success of Mazarin in the treaties of Westphalia and in compassing the collapse of the Fronde assured the triumph of the royal power and of nationalism, but did not involve the annihilation or even decimation of the feudal nobility, or the abolition or diminution of their privileges. The nobility and the clergy alike were compelled to accept the royal authority and to find their grandeur no longer in their own glory but in reflecting the splendor of royalty. The royal power in France was built upon substantial geographical, racial, and linguistic unity and upon an historical tradition of success and of realization of national ambitions. In contrast with England, however, royalty alone, in France, reaped the political fruits of the victory of the alliance of king and people against the nobility, for the states-general failed to develop from a feudal into a popular representative body or into an effective governmental institution, and from 1614 onward really ceased to exist.

The intelligence of the French people, the development of education, the policy of employing successful business men in administrative capacities, and the organization of local administration were such as to furnish the Bourbon monarchy with an efficient staff of officials in the various stages of the administrative system. On the whole, the provincial and local administrations were more intelligent, progressive, and efficient than the national ministries, which were permeated with favoritism and servility. Intendants found such scope for initiative that they achieved in their provinces reforms which the national government dared not undertake, or undertook only to fail, as in the case of Turgot.

In France, therefore, the royal power became the sole institutional expression of the unity, aims, and action of the nation. It was absolute in the field and its field was the best in Europe. At 1660 no state on the European continent could compare with France in its territorial compactness and its advantageous geographical situation, or in the homogeneity of its population and the solidarity and efficiency of its governmental system, or in the extent and exploitation of its economic resources.

The French monarchy of Louis XIV could readily command unquestioning national support in the twofold ambition of securing

national strategic frontiers and of achieving the paramountcy in the European system and hence the leadership in world empire. Monarchy in France faced no opposition, was confronted by no political institutions or moral authority or compelling necessity that would hold it to account. Consequently, prior to the humiliations of the Seven Years' War embodied in the treaty of Paris of 1763, even the criticisms and protests of the intellectual leaders had passed almost unheeded. Now, as the historian looks back over the period following the loss of Louisburg in 1745, he can detect many indications of the impending collapse, besides the presentiments of the Montesquieus, Diderots, Voltaires, Rousseaus, Argensons, and Quesnays of the inadequacy and faultiness of the existing system.

The output of the French mind on political, social, and economic questions in the 15 years beginning with the publication in 1748 of Montesquieu's Spirit of the Laws, and culminating in 1762 in the appearance of Rousseau's Social Contract, was destined not merely to compass the downfall of the French monarchy but to remake the political life of Europe. In those very years when France was formulating the thought of the coming age, two monarchs, the Prussian and the Austrian, were developing policies of efficiency in monarchical administration because war had taught them its necessity in the struggle for existence and for empire.

While it is notorious that the two most intelligent and progressive countries, England and France, did not exemplify the enlightened despotism, that movement had its home and did its most notable work in the lands nominally comprised in the Holy Roman Empire.

By the fifteenth century the Holy Roman Empire had fallen permanently into the hands of the Hapsburgs with their narrow dynasticism which negatived any movement toward sound national growth and unification. In face of the dilatory pettiness of Frederick III and the shallow knight errantry of Maximilian, every personage down to the humblest in the feudal hierarchy not merely asserted to the full his proper rights but also grasped greedily for further privileges and added powers. To such members of the nobility of the German nation Luther's famous address was an incomprehensible appeal, but the break with Rome was an opportunity eagerly seized for feudal aggrandizement and territorial expansion. That they enjoyed this liberty in full measure was due to the preoccupation of Charles V with multitudinous and world-wide interests such as previous emperors had never contemplated. What Charles V might have accomplished, had his hands been free, was forever too late when his weaker successors assumed their narrowed realms. While the emperors were

[1] It is remarkable that the wars of 1740 to 1763 led the Elder Pitt in England and Choiseul in France to concentrate governmental effort on the international situation to the almost complete neglect of internal interests, even of their possible effect in increasing the international efficiency of the state.

too distracted or too weak to erect a unified German national state at the expense of the striving feudal princelings, those same princelings were wresting every vestige of popular liberties from their subjects.

The peace of Augsburg of 1555 not only failed, as every effort to stabilize society always has, in the purpose of maintaining permanently the religious *status quo*, but its restrictive character bound the hands of the emperors from undertaking any nationalizing policy, while the disintregrating process of feudal aggrandizement persisted unchecked. The resulting civil wars of religion, known as the Thirty Years' War, afforded opportunity for each duke or count to seek his own fortune, even at the expense of treating with the neighboring nations and utilizing their intervention in German affairs.

The treaties of Westphalia, while establishing a revised and rigid ecclesiastical status for the German states, accorded to the various intervening neighbors the control of certain German lands and peoples and of the country's economic gateways. Thus, at the very time that England and France were entering upon careers of great maritime trade and colonial expansion, Germany saw its strategic districts expropriated and its once powerful Hansa wrecked. The left bank of the Rhine passed under French possession or influence and its lower course, as well as that of the Meuse, and the left bank of the Ems, was confirmed to the declining power of the Dutch. The mouths of the Weser, the Elbe, the Oder, and the Vistula fell into the hands of the Danes, Swedes, and Poles whose inadequate powers were wasted in internecine strife. The nominal limits of the Holy Roman Empire were greatly narrowed and the authority of the emperor and of the imperial institutions was reduced to a negligible, almost to an absurd, minimum. No one of the numerous, practically independent principalities within Germany was left with an area or resources that promised self-sufficiency, not to mention the possibility of effective development and leadership. The Hapsburg emperor abandoned in despair any hope of developing effective power in the empire on the basis of his Germanic and Slavic lands, and henceforth turned his attention to the recovery of the ancient limits of his Hungarian kingdom and the development of his new territorial interests in Italy.

Germany was left a helpless prey to its ambitious neighbors and to its own unconscionable and incompetent princes. Church and state had broken down and the anarchy of decadent feudalism alone remained. The condition of the people was hopeless. War and pestilence had reduced the population by half, and left some districts almost depopulated. The devastation of the country had been such that two centuries had to elapse before agricultural life was restored to its condition prior to the Thirty Years' War. The ruin of the towns was such that only 50 free cities, of which but few could boast of 10,000 souls, remained to preserve the memory rather than the

reality of the once vigorous town life. No institution of popular government—national, provincial, or municipal—remained to form a nucleus for new political growth. There was dearth of individuals with training or experience to fill the administrative posts. Even the universities had barely survived the catastrophe and must pass through a long period of convalescence before they could once more make their contribution to the re-creation of national life. Finally, and worst of all, the Thirty Years' War had left the nation in moral collapse. Materials, men, and principles were equally lacking for the process of reconstruction.

Yet, amid this havoc and squalor, one sordid creature had set himself with grim craft and patient guile to rehabilitate his wasted inheritance and to procure title to other lands. Almost alone among German princes, Frederick William, Margrave-Elector of Brandenburg, contrived to extract from the congresses of Westphalia, not merely guarantees of his ancestral possessions undiminished, but also the recognition of a strange assortment of claims to scattered morsels of territory. Thus his possessions, actual or claimed, were the most extensive within the empire, though they were scattered widely and held under a curious diversity of titles. Out of this assortment of territorial and political junk he had the shrewd insight and dogged persistence to begin the organization of a consolidated state.

Where no element or principle of unity existed, Frederick William evolved in his own mind the idea of a state to whose creation he gave himself unsparingly, and relentlessly required that every subject should do likewise. Every element and process in the operation were crassly material. Men were not free creatures endowed with intelligence, wills, and desires; they were but pawns or slaves to the fixed purpose, and that without exception of child, or wife, or self. Moral scruple or question of principle was never allowed to cross the path. As the historian follows step by step the devious ways of the Great Elector he finds his moral sense protesting against almost every act, and yet he can not withhold recognition of the resultant achievements of territorial extension and consolidation, of unified and absolute monarchical power, of the army steadily developed in numbers and effectiveness, of state treasure amassed, of economic resourses steadily developed, and of population both recruited from abroad and once more expanding by natural growth. Here were the conditions out of which grew the enlightened despotism, the elemental processes of its development, and the basic factors in its character.

Despite their weaker characters, lesser abilities, and peculiar foibles, the son Frederick I and the grandson Frederick William I carried forward the work with definite though modest contributions to the fixed purpose. The great-grandson, Frederick II, was first of these Hohenzollerns with the genius and daring for aggressive measures.

In his first and second Silesian wars he risked the whole achievement of three generations on the chance of a conspicuous conquest, and won, as much by his ruthless diplomacy as by military ability.

None the less this experience confirmed Frederick in the Hohenzollern conception of the state and of the methods of its enhancement. He realized that the life and growth of the state were dependent upon the maintenance of an effective military machine, which in turn could be maintained and operated only with large and readily available financial power, which could alone be drawn from the fullest exploitation of the state's economic resources by the steady hard work of its subjects.

The ten years' truce which followed the treaty of Dresden (1745) might be described as the adolescent period of the enlightened despotism. It still awaits proper study from this point of view, which is more important than the diplomatic one which has customarily held the attention. While Frederick devoted himself unremittingly during this interval to the improvement of his army and finances and to the development of the economic resources of his dominions, his defeated opponent, Maria Theresa, was not blind to the lessons of defeat and set herself likewise with indefatigable earnestness to achieve in similar ways such results for Austria that the struggle might be renewed, the lost provinces retrieved, and the national honor redeemed.

In his task Frederick conceived of himself as the first servant of the state. Unlike the Bourbon who could identify himself with the state, the Hohenzollern had been forced to conceive of the state as an entity apart from himself or his subjects though including them. The state was something above persons and more permanent and enduring than individuals. Such a concept could scarcely have been developed in England or France, while it was not an unnatural adaptation from the theory of the universal and paramount state which, rather than any concrete realization thereof, had subsisted for centuries as the Holy Roman Empire.

It appears, therefore, that the first efforts to practice as a deliberate policy the basic principles of the enlightened despotism began prior to the appearance of any of the important French writings mentioned previously and had been interrupted by the Seven Years' War before some of the more significant of them had appeared. This earliest phase of enlightened despotism was, then, little more than two parallel national campaigns of preparedness in two rival states, between two rival dynasties, in anticipation of a desperate military struggle for leadership within the German lands. On either side the purpose was the strengthening and girding of the state for aggrandizement; on the one hand to hold a recently captured province, on the other to recover that lost province, which each regarded as the key to the situation. Each side considered that the outcome

of the struggle would be determined by the effectiveness of the marshaling of the resources of the state in support of its military program. The results justified the policy, for Frederick's own efforts retained the province which the consistent policy of his predecessors had made it possible for him to seize and it left him in the position of primacy in Germany. On the other hand, while Maria Theresa failed in these purposes, she emerged from the struggle with her powers greatly strengthened in her remaining dominions and in a position to recoup military losses in Germany through political gains in Italy and Poland.

It is also important to note that in both cases the monarch was dealing with lands devoid of geographic unity and awkwardly situated so that they lacked the natural and strategic frontiers which, in whole or in large measure, characterized England and France. Military power was essential to offset the lack of nature's gifts, in which matter Prussia labored under the more serious handicap. Furthermore, neither state could compare with England or France in the racial and linguistic homogeneity of its population, though in this respect the handicap of Austria was the more serious. In still other matters both states were at serious disadvantage as compared with England and France. Neither could enjoy the advantage of a compact and harmoniously developed and organized political system, for geography denied it to Prussia and race withheld it from Austria. Nor could either utilize the priceless heritage of historic solidarity with a venerable record of national cooperation in enduring severe tests and effecting glorious achievements which constitutes such powerful challenge to each new generation to maintain the honor of the national name and the security of the national estate. Then, again, neither Frederick nor Maria Theresa could rely upon their prestige, whether as individuals or as the hereditary chiefs of their respective dynasties, to rally their subjects to their support.

In each case, therefore, the consolidation of subjects and resources had to be achieved by other means. Policy must serve where nature and history failed. It was impossible to bide the time which should prove to each province and people its better welfare and larger opportunity within the state to which it happened to belong than might be its lot in any other possible state. The monarch must prejudge such decision and act for himself and his subjects on the assumed truth of such conclusion. He must not leave the question open to the slightest doubt; he must think and plan and act for himself and his subjects, and compel his subjects to cooperate in action without thinking. It was not the part of the subject to think, but only to obey as if under martial law. Popular or constitutional government was impossible of consideration. Neither the church nor feudalism could be relied upon as voluntary or self-convinced associates, for

apparent self-interest might readily lead them to other conclusions. Despotism was the only possible solution, and it must follow a policy so obviously reasonable—enlightened—that it should not arouse any doubts but should secure, with a minimum of friction or delay, the maximum result.

Neither the monarch nor the monarchy, but the state, was the ultimate entity to which all else must be subordinate. The state was an utterly intangible and unembodiable thing but none the less extremely real. It was that policy which comprehended the necessities and ideals whose attainment bound sovereign and subjects alike to service for their realization as the absolute general welfare for the present and even more for the future. For the attainment of the ends of the state, coin or commodity, toil or life were alike things to be expended with frugality or with abandon, as circumstances might require. No benevolent sentiment or humane motive, but sheer cold reason—enlightenment, was to determine the methods to be pursued, or was to be considered as an end for which the state existed, though humanitarianism might very possibly chance to be incidental to both methods and aims. The ends sought were the permanency, security, and aggrandizement of the state, for these were the sole safeguards in the struggle for existence which lands and peoples so situated as Prussia and Austria have ever felt compelled to seek.

In conclusion, I can only emphasize the priority in the development of the policies of Frederick the Great and Maria Theresa to the appearance of the great creative writings of the French political and economic thinkers to whom has customarily been ascribed the initiative for the enlightened despotism. The exaltation of the state rather than of the monarch, the undermining of provincial rights and class privileges, the effort to secure uniformity in the incidence of governmental authority, the demand on the administrative system for efficiency, the efforts for codification of law and the reform of the judicial system, the aggressive instead of intriguing diplomacy, the more comprehensive demands for military service, the improved military organization, the more thorough systematization of the finances, the fuller recognition that government finances are dependent upon sound economic conditions—these all appeared in Frederick's policy in the first decade of his reign and were promptly copied with more or less success by Maria Theresa. On the religious side, the enlightenment was a personal, scarcely a governmental, interest with Frederick, and altogether abhorrent to Maria Theresa. It was only with Joseph II that this element developed as not merely a personal interest but also as a wide-reaching governmental policy.[1]

[1] In this paper no account has been taken of the reforming or enlightened ministers of the eighteenth century prior to 1763, for their interesting activities were only accidentally related to the enlightened despotism and belong properly to the history of political adventure, e.g. Law, Alberoni and Pombal.

IX. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW POLAND

By COL. LUCIUS H. HOLT, U. S. A.
United States Military Academy

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW POLAND

By Lucius H. Holt

The purpose of this paper is to discuss a single phase of the general subject. No attention will be paid, accordingly, to military, territorial, economic, and social issues, except as passing reference may be necessary to sketch in a background. I shall give a simple, direct narrative of Poland's efforts to solve her political problem. My subject, then, more strictly defined, is: The reestablishment of a Polish government.

During the long period of subjection to foreign powers Polish leaders had never lost the hope that an opportunity might present itself to strike for an independent Poland. Two divergent policies existed—the first for a revived Poland under the good auspices of Austria-Hungary, whose government had extended liberal political rights to Galicia; the second for a revived Polish state living in friendship with the great Slav Russian nation. Both policies were, of course, directed toward ultimate independence for Poland.

The outbreak of the Great War was recognized by the Polish leaders as Poland's opportunity. Two important committees were at once formed to represent Polish interests, the first a Polish national council at St. Petersburg, with Wielopolski and Dmowski, Polish representatives in the Russian Duma, as organizers; and the second a supreme national committee at Cracow in Galicia, first with Doctor Leo and soon afterwards with Jaworski at its head, both men being Polish deputies to the Austrian Parliament.

So far as we are concerned, the activities of the Wielopolski-Dmowski group during the early years of the war need not delay us long. Its importance in the Russian theater was cut short after the Russian Revolution in 1917 and the subsequent break-up of Russia as a power. It later reorganized as the Polish national committee in Lausanne, Switzerland, August 15, 1917, with Dmowski as chairman, and Paderewski, Sobanski, Skirment, Zamojski, Piltz, and Fronczak as influential members. Later it moved to Paris. The part which this committee played in the closing scenes of the war and in the political affairs in Poland after the armistice we shall mention in due time.

We turn now to trace events within the boundaries of the distinctively Polish territories. Jaworski's supreme national committee received the support of important political groups in Galicia, and, though not officially recognized by Austria-Hungary, became the spokesman for the Polish policies and ideals. In collaboration with this committee, General Pilsudski undertook the recruiting of Polish legions to engage against Russia in conjunction with the Austro-Hungarian armies. The committee's first manifesto ended with these words:

> Under Polish command, and in close connection with the chief direction of the Austro-Hungarian army, the Polish legions will enter the struggle in order that they may also throw upon the scales of the greatest war a deed worthy of the Polish nation, as a condition and beginning of a brighter future.

Notice two facts with respect to this supreme national committee and its activities. In the first place, though it had the support of influential groups in Galicia, it failed to receive general Polish recognition, largely because the people feared that its pro-Austrian policy might defeat the ultimate object of Polish independence and leave Poland at the end of the war bound to Austria and her ally, Germany. In the second place, the cooperation of the Polish legions with the Austro-Hungarian armies did not imply Polish sympathy with the general cause and policies of the Central Powers. The effort of the Polish legions was directed against Russia, not to achieve victory for the Germans, but to free Poland from one of the worst systems of tyranny the modern civilized world has known. Under agreement with the Austro-Hungarian government, the Polish legions were to be maintained as a separate military unit and were to be used only against Russia.

For more than two years the supreme national committee in Poland continued its existence, though always unauthorized and unofficial. During this period, as we know, Poland became the cockpit of the eastern theater of war. The Russian hordes surged across the country both to the north and to the south, and were met and hurled back by the German and Austrian armies. In their retreat, the Russians, on the plea of military necessity, devastated the land. It was not until the autumn of 1915 that the German-Austrian armies established their lines along the eastern Polish boundaries.

With their country under German-Austrian control, the members of the supreme national committee turned to the governments of the Central Powers for recognition, but received little encouragement. The German-Austrian armies held the lines, the German-Austrian civil authorities took over the entire civil administration of the country, German-Austrian agents superintended the systematic requisitioning of supplies, and the Central Governments began to exert pressure upon the Poles to enlist in the German-Austrian bodies for

service on any front. Neither Germany nor Austria entertained favorably any idea of Polish independence so long as the country yielded supplies and there remained a chance of drawing recruits.

In the autumn of 1916 two prominent Poles, one in political and the other in military life, took steps to hasten the recognition of Polish independence. By the middle of August, Pilsudski requested permission to resign his command of the legionaries; following this request August 30 with a memorial to the supreme national committee requesting its cooperation in his plan to separate the legionaries from the Austro-Hungarian armies and to make them an autonomous independent Polish army. September 20, 1916, the Central Powers agreed to the principle of Pilsudski's memorial. In the meanwhile Ignace Daszynski, a prominent Socialist deputy in the Austrian Parliament, resigned early in September from the Polish Parliamentary Club at Vienna in the endeavor to influence the members of that important political club to demand from the Austro-Hungarian government a statement of its intentions with respect to the creation of an independent Polish state. A few days later the club did present such a memorial to the Austrian Parliament, and Daszynski, September 19, rejoined the club.

The action of Daszynski and Pilsudski convinced the German-Austrian governments, not only that nothing further was to be gained by delay, but that Polish sentiment might be swayed in their favor by a decided change of front. They therefore hastened negotiations. November 5, 1916, the Austro-Hungarian Emperor and the German Emperor issued a joint manifesto announcing that they had "resolved to form of these (Polish) territories an independent State with a hereditary monarchy and a constitutional government."

This manifesto was greeted cordially as the first step toward achieving independence for a united Poland. A Polish provisional regent, known as the Marshal of the Crown, was appointed; and a council of state was organized, composed of all political parties, religious creeds, and social classes. On January 15, 1917, the new council of state met for the first time. The Polish legions, released by Austria from their allegiance, pledged their loyalty to the provisional Polish government and became the nucleus of the new Polish army. All political, civil, and religious bodies in Poland likewise pledged themselves to support the new government.

The leading Poles realized, however, that their dreams of a united Poland were still far from fulfillment. Germany indicated that Posnania was not to be a part of the new State; and Austria-Hungary announced new political powers to Galicia in a statement which showed that Austro-Hungarian control was to be maintained over that province. And further, the German governor general remained in Poland, interfered in Polish affairs, seized food supplies, transported

thousands of Polish laborers to Germany, and demanded that the new Polish government raise a large army to fight under German command against the Allies. Pilsudski, followed by the bulk of the legionaries, not only refused to enlist to aid Germany, but began secretly to organize a new military force to act as opportunity offered against Germany. He was seized and imprisoned in the fortress of Magdeburg. The provisional government, disaffected by the turn of events and the lack of sympathy on the part of the Central Powers with Polish ambitions, was replaced by a new government September 12, 1917, composed of a regency council of three (Archbishop Kakowski, Prince Lubomirski, and Count Ostrowski) and a cabinet headed by Kucharewski. Whatever of prestige had remained for the supreme national committee was fatally weakened, for this committee was considered responsible for the relations between Poland and the Central Powers.

The climax to German perfidy, however, came in the treaty negotiation between the Central Powers and Russia at Brest-Litovsk in February, 1918. Without consulting the Poles, Germany ceded the Polish district of Kholm to the new state of Ukrainia in return for promised food supplies. All Poland protested at this conscienceless barter. The manifesto of November 5, 1916, was fully discredited; evidently it was but a "scrap of paper" in the sight of the Emperor. Kucharewski's cabinet resigned; the regency council published a bitter protest to the Central Powers; the Polish delegates in the German Reichstag introduced a resolution of protest there; and the Polish delegates in the Austro-Hungarian Parliament withdrew their support of the von Seydler cabinet, and von Seydler was forced to resign. Though the transfer of Kholm was never consummated, knowledge of the intention of the Central Powers was sufficient to destroy their credit with the Poles. The supreme national committee, its prestige now wholly destroyed, passed out of existence.

One good effect, however, the German-Austrian manifesto had. It forced the Polish problem upon the attention of the Allied Powers. These powers could not well promise less than the Central Powers had promised. Consequently, on January 8, 1918, President Wilson included the independence of Poland as number 13 of his famous fourteen points; and five months later (June 3, 1918) the representatives of the Entente Powers at Versailles issued a statement favoring "a free and independent Poland with access to the sea."

The tumult of the armistice period was now at hand. We all remember how suddenly the Austro-German power crumbled. Poles took immediate advantage of the new situation. During the confused days in late October and early November, 1918, separate governments were speedily organized in the three great divisions of Poland as the grip of the Central Powers relaxed. In Russian Poland, Pilsudski,

returning November 10 from his German prison to receive the universal acclaim of his countrymen, accepted from the regency council the mission as chief of state to carry his country through to a constitutional government. A Socialist government, formed by Daszynski November 14, gave way a week later to a Socialist cabinet with Moraczewski as premier. In conjunction with Pilsudski, this cabinet bent all its energies to defending Poland against its most pressing enemies and to securing internal peace and order. In Galicia the Polish deputies to the old Austrian Parliament met at Cracow October 28, declared Austrian-Poland a part of the Polish State, and effected a temporary organization. This Galician group refused later, however, to recognize the Socialist government organized at Warsaw. In Posnania the Polish deputies to the old Reichstag and the Polish members of the Prussian chamber met November 18, arranged for a meeting of trusted representatives of the public December 3, and effected a temporary organization. This Posnanian group could not bring itself to recognize Pilsudski and the existing Warsaw government. It thereupon announced its recognition of the Polish national committee in Paris as representative of the interests of German Poland.

Pilsudski's problem was immeasurably increased in difficulty for the moment by the existence of these other Polish governments. He set himself resolutely to the task of establishing in Russian Poland a representative government, announcing November 28, 1918, that elections would be held January 26, 1919, for a constitutional assembly, and that every citizen of Poland, without distinction of race, religion, nationality, or sex, would have equal political rights and would be qualified to participate in the elections. At the same time he continued negotiations with the leaders in the other sections of Poland with the object of coming to a satisfactory agreement and achieving unity.

Before the date set for these elections in Russian Poland, the unendurable political situation had partially been cleared. Pilsudski and his Socialist government had the advantage of being established in what was universally recognized must be the heart and capital of the new Poland; but the Dmowski group, associated with whom was now the world-famous Paderewski, had the allegiance of Posnania and much sympathy in Galicia. Paderewski served as the agent in bringing about a compromise. When he entered Posnania in late December, 1918, the warmth of his welcome indicated the political complexion of the people as well as his own personal popularity. With this support, and with the common knowledge that his group was favored and recognized by the Allies, he passed over into Russian Poland, entered Warsaw the first of the new year, and conferred with Pilsudski. Just what passed between the two is not known, but it is suspected that Paderewski opened negotiations on the basis of the dis-

missal of Moraczewski and of certain other of the Socialist ministers. While negotiations were continuing, a group of men, led by Prince Sapieha and Colonel Januszajtis, and inspired by hostility to the socialist tendencies of the Pilsudski-Moraczewski government, attempted on the night of January 4–5 a coup d'état. The coup was an opéra bouffe affair. The conspirators arrested the ministers, but the man sent to arrest Pilsudski failed, and the one sent to arrest the chief of staff of the army was himself put under arrest by that general. The following day Pilsudski at once secured the release of his ministers and himself imprisoned a few of the suspects, among them Prince Sapieha. This attempted coup was not allowed to interfere with the progress of the negotiations, and a few days later Paderewski was invited to form a cabinet on a coalition basis. Paderewski accepted the mission and himself took office as Premier and Foreign Minister January 18, 1919, just eight days before the elections.

All interest was now centered upon these elections. Deputies to the number of 524 were to be chosen from the whole of Poland. Actually, of course, the elections could be held only in those parts of Poland under Polish control. To meet this situation, it was agreed that exceptional steps should be taken for the other parts of Poland. For Galicia 77 deputies were elected, and 94 were called from the old Austrian Parliament. In Posnania the election of the 112 deputies assigned was not held until June 1, the Posnanian deputies in the old German Reichstag sitting in the meanwhile. In Russian Poland, all the 241 deputies were elected. The representation of minorities was guaranteed by the adoption of a system of proportional representation.

The results of the election justified the high hopes of those who had confidence in the orderly political development of Poland. The National Bloc in support of the Paderewski government polled by far the largest number of votes. In Warsaw itself this bloc polled 150,000, the Jewish parties 74,000, and the Socialists only 42,000 votes, the bloc electing both Paderewski and Dmowski among their candidates. Of the total number of 318 representatives elected, the National Bloc had 109. Two weeks later, February 9, 1919, the first meeting of this constitutional assembly was inaugurated by religious ceremonies at the Church of St. John in Warsaw; and February 21, 1919, official announcement was issued that the Allies recognized the Polish government headed by Pilsudski as President and Paderewski as Premier.

These steps marked the completion of one distinct stage in Poland's progress toward the establishment of a new government. Her people had chosen a representative assembly, and her government had received the recognition of the victorious Allies. Much, however, still remained to be done. Perhaps, if we summarize briefly the general situation, the difficulties will be more apparent.

In the first place, Poland was surrounded by active enemies each of whom claimed territory which Poland regarded as distinctively Polish. The Germans had not given up Posnania; the Czechoslovaks were disputing the possession of the Teschen district; a shadowy Ukrainian government was holding eastern Galicia; the Soviet lines were still drawn too near Warsaw; and the Lithuanians expected Wilna. The allied recognition had contained no assurance of Poland's boundaries, so the Government felt it necessary to take active measures to secure what it considered to be Polish rights. Add to this territorial question the social unrest both among the laboring classes and among the peasantry; the racial antagonisms engendered by the presence of large self-conscious units of different blood and customs, as Jews, Ruthenians, and Germans; and throw over the whole scene the pall of a universal economic distress so paralyzing that we in this fat country can not appreciate it; and you may gain some faint conception of the general situation that confronted the Polish Government in the spring of 1919.

Although the Assembly had as its original purpose the creation of a constitution, the necessities of the situation prevented it from proceeding at once to this task. Through the spring and summer of 1919, all attention was concentrated upon the proceedings of the Peace Conference at Paris and Versailles. It was essential that Poland's boundaries should be assured before Poland's constitution could be drawn. Paderewski in person argued the Polish cause before the representatives of the Powers. Once, discouraged, he tendered his resignation to the Assembly (May 13, 1919), but the Assembly expressed its confidence in him and he retained his position. As Premier he signed the treaty of June 28, 1919, unsatisfactory as it appeared to be. During July he presented the treaty to the Assembly. July 31, 1919, the Assembly duly ratified the treaty. Poland's position was thus secured by an international covenant, signed by friends and enemies alike.

Even after the ratification of this treaty the Assembly found it impossible to proceed rapidly to the work of framing a constitution. Territorial questions were still to be settled, some by plebiscites and some by the Powers in the future; economic conditions presented constantly new problems calling for consideration and action; and military operations, especially on the Russian front, continued on a large scale. December 7, 1919, Paderewski resigned, being succeeded a week later by Skulski.

In the spring and summer of 1920 came the terrific Polish-Bolshevik campaign. At its height, Skulski was forced to resign June 9 in favor of a cabinet headed by Grabski. A month later, July 9, Grabski resigned and was succeeded by the peasant premier, Witos. We know how the Bolshevik menace was turned back, and how

negotiations for a Russian-Polish peace were finally carried to a successful conclusion. During all this troubled period, of course, slight progress could be made toward framing a permanent constitution.

Our story of the reestablishment of a Polish government must, then, be incomplete, for at the present date the constitution has not been adopted. Since the Russian-Polish armistice, however, the Assembly has been able to devote more time to its chief task. The document under consideration contains 6 chapters and 131 articles. Chapter 1, containing articles 1 and 2, states the form of government, which will be that of a republic. Chapter 2, containing articles 3 to 38, inclusive, deals with the legislature and prescribes a bicameral body. Chapter 3, containing articles 39 to 75, inclusive, deals with the executive and his functions and powers. Chapter 4, including articles 76 to 88, inclusive, deals with the judiciary. Chapter 5, including articles 89 to 130, inclusive, deals with citizenship and the general rights and duties of citizens. Chapter 6, containing a single article, prescribes the method of amending and changing the constitution. Of the entire document, 113 of the articles have been agreed upon by the Assembly and have passed two readings. Articles 35 and 36, concerning the upper house of the legislature, and article 39, concerning the election of the President of the Republic, are at present under discussion.

With this statement, which brings the story up to include the latest available information, I leave my outline of Poland's measures to reestablish a government. The country's many other problems—territorial, military, social, and economic—still present the utmost difficulties, but the problem of a government is almost solved.

X. THE SETTLEMENT AT PLYMOUTH CONTEMPLATED BEFORE 1620

By LINCOLN N. KINNICUTT
Massachusetts Historical Society

THE SETTLEMENT AT PLYMOUTH CONTEMPLATED BEFORE 1620

By Lincoln N. Kinnicutt

Was it by mere chance that the Pilgrims found Plymouth Harbor and Plymouth, or had schemes and plans been made by those most interested in the colonization of New England to attempt to bring them to this very spot? I am inclined to believe that before the *Mayflower* sailed from England Sir Ferdinando Gorges had made plans which, if successful, would lead to a settlement in Plymouth Harbor, a locality about which he was well informed and which he had reasons to believe was the most favorable location on the Massachusetts coast.

We owe much to Sir Ferdinando Gorges, much more than he has ever received, and in speaking of him as the father of New England colonization we give him a title he well deserves. His whole life is an interesting story, full of interesting episodes, stirring events, and narrow escapes from political intrigues and combinations, and even from royal displeasure. A man of sound judgment, of infinite resourcefulness and pertinacity, the motto on his coat of arms "Constans et Fidelis" was more truly symbolical of his character than is often found.

He was the son of Edward Gorges of Wraxall and a descendant of Ranoly de Gorges, who came from Normandy to the conquest of England in 1066. The exact date of his birth is not known but he was born about 1562. His whole life must have been influenced by the corrupt age in which his early manhood was passed, when royal favoritism, intrigue, and bribery, were apparently the only paths to position, power, or wealth.

Very little is known of Sir Ferdinando Gorges until 1588. At that time he was captain in the English army in Flanders, and was taken prisoner by the Spanish, probably at the siege of Sluis, but was immediately exchanged. The next year, 1589, he took part in the siege of Paris, where he was severely wounded. Documents tell us that he was borne from the walls by Henry of Navarre himself. In 1595 he was ordered to take charge of the erection of fortifications at Plymouth, and in 1596 he was appointed captain and keeper of the new fortification and of the island of St. Nicholas. He held this

most important post for nearly 40 years, for Plymouth was deemed a vulnerable point for Spanish invasion. Queen Elizabeth, James I, and Charles I thus bore witness to their confidence in his ability and trustworthiness. In this long service there was one interim of three years, probably the most fateful years in his whole life, for he was a close friend of the Earl of Essex and had joined with him, although, I believe, unwillingly, in his conspiracy against the Queen. If he did betray his friend and benefactor, which was the belief and always remained the belief of the Puritans, although to-day doubted by many, it was the blot on his escutcheon.

The Earl of Essex for some incomprehensible reason was the great hero of the Puritans, and they ever remembered that tragic, stormy scene at his trial when Essex, turning to Gorges, said, "I pray you answer me, did you advise me to leave my enterprise?" And Gorges, answering, "I think I did." Essex replied, "Nay, it is no time to answer now upon thinking, these are not things to be forgotten. Did you indeed so counsel me?" And Gorges replying, "I did," he sealed the fate of his friend and forged a weapon that was used many years after to destroy practically his own great ambitions and many of the advantages which he had hoped to obtain in the New World. Essex's despairing final appeal to his judges was never forgotten by the Puritan party: "My Lords, look upon Sir Ferdinando and see if he looks like himself. All the world shall see by my death and his life whose testimony is the truest."

After the execution of Essex, Gorges, while in prison, expecting a sentence of death, wrote a bold, pathetic defense against the charge that he had betrayed Essex, his friend. After one year's imprisonment he was pardoned, and on the death of Queen Elizabeth in 1603 was reinstated in his former command at Plymouth.

If this was an age of intrigue, corruption, and bribery, it was also the age of adventure, discovery, and exploration. Sir Humphrey Gilbert and Sir Walter Ralegh belonged to that age and Gorges was their kinsman through the Champernouns. Spain was reaping a rich harvest from her conquests in Mexico and South America, and Sir Ferdinando had intimate knowledge of the great riches brought into English harbors by captured Spanish ships, for he was one of the commissioners to whose custody these great riches were intrusted.

In 1602 Gosnold returned from Buzzards Bay with a valuable cargo of furs and sassafras. In 1603 Martin Pring came from Cape Cod Bay with glowing accounts of the richness of the country, and in 1605 Weymouth explored a part of the coast of Maine, and on his return brought with him five savages, of whom Sir Ferdinando took charge of three. One of them, he tells us, was Tisquantum (Squanto) who, 15 years later, rendered to the Pilgrims indispensable service. From this time until his death, 40 years later, he devoted his extraordinary

energy, his influence, and his wealth to the colonization of New England.

Although some historians have questioned this statement in regard to Tisquantum, nevertheless we certainly have Gorges's own statement that he had Squanto with him for three years in England, and in another part of his Narration, speaking of the letter containing news from Dermer that he had found Tisquantum in Maine, he writes of him as "one of my Indians." By this statement Tisquantum must have been under his care at some previous time. Gorges also tells us, in the same Narration, that he made his Indians give him minute details of their native places, of their rivers, of their lands, their chiefs, and their enemies.

Sir Ferdinando Gorges must have known much about Patuxet (Plymouth) and Plymouth Harbor, and even about Massasoit, for Tisquantum was a native of Patuxet and a subject of Massasoit. It is also reasonable to suppose that Sir Ferdinando had other very early knowledge of Plymouth, for he was indefatigable in searching for, and acquiring, all information possible of northern Virginia, his territory.

We know that Martin Pring was at New Plymouth in 1603, living there for six weeks with 40 of his men, naming it Mount Aldworth and calling the harbor Whitsons Bay. He gave minute descriptions of the place and harbor, of the surrounding country, and of the products of the land.

Samuel de Champlain's account of Plymouth, in which he named it Port de Malabarre, was published in 1613.

In the month of April, 1614, Captain John Smith, with whom we associate Virginia and Pocahontas far more than New England and Plymouth, although he gave New England its name, was sent by a few English merchants to the north part of Virginia "to take whales and make tryalls of a myne of Gold and Copper." In August, 1614, on Smith's return to England he immediately reported his adventures and his discoveries to Sir Ferdinando Georges, "his honorable friende." From this circumstance it is a fair supposition that Gorges had taken much interest in John Smith's comtemplated voyage and may have given him certain instructions in respect to exploring the New England coast.

To Sir Ferdinando Gorges he would have given the description and the name of the various towns afterwards published, and of Plymouth he says, "then came you to Accomack (Plymouth), an excellent good harbor, good landing, and no want of anything but industrious people."

On the map that Captain John Smith published the next year, when English names were substituted, is inscribed "The most remark-

able parts thus named by the high and mighty Prince Charles, Prince of Great Britain."

At this time Prince Charles was only 15 years old, and probably the English names adopted were suggested to him by some one much interested in that part of the New World. From whatever source it came, the rechristening of Accomack as Plymouth must have been pleasing to Sir Ferdinando, for he loved old Plymouth well, where he had already spent nearly 20 years of his life.

John Smith's glowing account of New England, with its wonderful climate, its fertile soil and its mineral wealth, the abundance of fish, birds, and animals (he called Massachusetts "the Paradise of all these parts"), aroused the mercantile and venturesome spirit of the English, and spurred Sir Ferdinando to greater efforts to accomplish what had become the chief object of his life—the colonization of New England and the establishing on its shores of at least one plantation.

He had already experienced many failures. His first attempt was in 1605, when he sent a ship under the command of Capt. Henry Challons, with the intention of settling a colony on the coast of Maine. This was a complete failure, owing to Captain Challons' disobedience of orders. In 1607, in cooperation with Chief Justice Popham, Gorges attempted the Popham Colony, so called, the earliest settled colony in New England, for it existed for one year, but, as we know, was abandoned in the fall of 1608.

The attempts were made under the charter of the Plymouth Company, first granted in 1606, which company in 1620 was called the Council of New England. Sir Ferdinando Gorges was practically the Plymouth Company and the Council of New England, for without his leadership and his constant petitions to Parliament and to the throne the Plymouth Colony would probably have been overshadowed by the South Virginia or the London Company.

After receiving the report of Capt. John Smith and after the arrival of Smith's second ship, commanded by Capt. Thomas Hunt, which had also been sent to Plymouth to secure a cargo for the Old World, Sir Ferdinando began more active operations.

Two months after the arrival of Smith at Plymouth Sir John Hawkins, who had been chosen president of the Plymouth Council, attempted a voyage to New England which was unsuccessful, and Gorges opened negotiations with Captain Smith to undertake the planting of a colony on the Massachusetts coast. Smith was supplied with two ships, but, when only a short distance from England, the larger was disabled and he was obliged to return. Repairs being made he again started, but his ship was captured by a French cruiser and he was carried a prisoner into a French port. In 1616 Gorges dispatched another ship under Richard Vines, with the same unsuccessful result. In 1617 Smith, who had returned to England,

was supplied by the council with three small ships to make again a venture, but the ships were becalmed and after much delay returned to the harbor and the attempt was given up.

One of the two ships supplied to John Smith in 1615 was under the command of Capt. Thomas Dermer, who also was in the employ of Sir Ferdinando Gorges, and this small vessel reached Newfoundland in safety. We know but little of Captain Dermer for the next two years, although it is supposed he remained in Newfoundland, for in 1618 Gorges received communication from him in Newfoundland that he had found Tisquantum. Gorges immediately gave instructions to have Tisquantum sent to him, and in the latter part of 1618 Captain Dermer, with Tisquantum, arrived in England. Gorges states in his Narration that after consulting with Dermer in relation to "particulars of highest consequence and best considerations," he sent him back as fast as one Gorges's own ships could be made ready, and Tisquantum went with him.

This was early in 1619. Dermer was to meet Captain Rowcroft, who had been sent out the year before, and was to carry out certain specific plans and wait for further instructions from Gorges. Dermer did not find Rowcroft, but, as Gorges narrates, "so resolved he was that he ceased not to follow the designs already agreed upon," part of which evidently was to explore Tisquantum's own country, Plymouth. From a letter written to Sir Samuel Purchase, dated December 27, 1619 we know Dermer certainly did this important work, guided by Tisquantum.

The land in the immediate vicinity of Plymouth he found unoccupied, for the Patuxet Tribe, whose home it was, had been entirely swept away by the so-called plague. Tisquantum found not one of his own tribe remaining. They travelled two days' journey to the west, and two Indian kings came to visit them, probably Massasoit and his brother, Quadaquina.

Evidently Gorges was kept well informed in regard to Dermer's movements, for he states that Dermer sent him a journal of his proceedings and a description of the coast all along as he passed. From Plymouth he went to Capawac, Marthas Vineyard, probably in search of a mine, and then returned to Monhegan. Leaving Tisquantum in Maine, he went to Virginia, but, returning in the spring of 1620, on his way north to Monhegan he again visited Plymouth and probably Tisquantum joined him there. It is this visit which is referred to by Governor Bradford in his History of Plymouth Plantation.

This Mr. Dermer was here the same year that these people came, as appears by a relation written by him and given me by a friend bearing date June 30 Anno. 1620. And they came in November following, so ther was but 4 months difference. In which relation to his honored friend, he hath these passages of this very place.

I will first begine (saith he) with that place from whence Squanto, or Tisquantum, was taken away; which in Capt. Smiths mape is called Plimoth; and I would that

Plimoth had the like commodities. I would that the first plantation might hear be seated, if ther come to the number of 50 persons, or upward. Otherwise at Charlton, because ther the savages are less to be feared. The Pocanawkits, which live to the west of Plimoth, bear an invetrate malice to the English, and are of more streingth than all the savages from thence to Penobscote. * * * The soil of the borders of this great bay, may be compared to most of the plantations which I see in Virginia.

In the botume of the great bay is store of codd and basse, or mulett, etc. But above all he comends Pacanawkite for the richest soyle, and much open gronnd fitt for English graine, etc.

In 1619 Thomas Dermer remained in Tisquantum's country for five or six days at least, exploring the country about Plymouth.

It would be most interesting to know more about this letter, to know to whom it was written, and for what purpose. Did Governor Bradford see it before he sailed from England? We should like to know the exact contents of the letter, for Governor Bradford omitted part. Probably it was written to Sir Ferdinando Gorges, for Dermer was in his employ, and as the *Mayflower* did not sail from England until September, the letter could have been given to Bradford before that time. Evidently Capt. Thomas Dermer had decided that Plymouth was the place above all others to make a settlement, and from this letter he apparently made a much closer study of the locality and all the surrounding conditions than he had made on his first visit the year before. He speaks particularly about the Pocanawkets. This was the name given to the Indians who comprised the Pocanawket Confederacy, and included at least nine tribes living in Bristol, Plymouth, and Barnstable Counties and part of Worcester County. This confederacy also exercised some authority in Nantucket and Marthas Vineyard, and Massasoit was their chief, and Plymouth and all the land about Plymouth was their territory. Dermer speaks of them as the strongest of all the confederacies and tells of the malice they bore to the English, and the reason. But he also speaks of Squanto, or Tisquantum, as having enough influence among them to save his life, and Squanto was one of their own tribe. After all, Dermer commends Pocanawket, an Indian village two days' journey from Plymouth, for the richest soil and much open ground fit for English grain.

Did he rely on Tisquantum being able to establish friendly relations, should a colony be established at Plymouth? If he did so, he certainly judged wisely, as subsequent events proved.

Sir Ferdinando Gorges, writing in 1622, says of Thomas Dermer: "He remained in the discovery of that coast two years, giving us good content in all his undertakings; and after he had made the peace between us and the savages that so much abhorred our nation for the wrongs done them by others, as you have heard; but the fruit of his labor in that behalf we as yet receive to our great commoditie, who have a peaceable plantation at the present time among them, where our

people both prosper, and live in good taking and assuredness of their neighbors." (This was Plymouth.)

This good understanding, however, was in my opinion all accomplished by Tisquantum, for from the first he seemed to have much influence among the Indians. After this visit to Plymouth, Dermer went again to Monhegan and in July or in August again returned to Cape Cod Bay, and Bradford states that Tisquantum was with him.

This brings us to within a comparatively few weeks before the Pilgrims were expected to land on our coast, for their plans had been made for a departure from England about July 23, 1620. As we know, the plans were unexpectedly changed. If they had landed on Cape Cod at the expected time they could scarcely have failed of meeting Captain Dermer.

Capawick (Marthas Vineyard) seems to have been one of the objective points for many of Sir Ferdinando Gorges's ventures, and this was on account of supposed mines which, from Indian tales, he believed would be discovered on Marthas Vineyard or Nantucket.

At this time the first object for which he was striving was to find the most desirable place on the Massachusetts coast to plant a colony and then to establish it; and his second object was to find new sources of wealth in the New World.

In 1619 Captain Dermer had explored every harbor from the Penobscot to Cape Cod, according to Gorges, and had visited Capawick. In 1620 he had again explored the country about Plymouth, had decided it was the best place for a colony and had so written, and then, going to Monhegan, had returned to the Cape Cod coast and to Capawick, where he supposed he had established friendly relations with the Indians.

If Dermer wished for any reason to meet the Pilgrim ship, Marthas Vineyard and Nantucket offered many advantages for obtaining early information of its arrival. It would have been almost impossible for a ship to approach Cape Cod from any direction without it being known, at least by the Indians, and Squanto was with Dermer as an interpreter and intermediator. The distance across the Cape at a point opposite Capawick is very short.

It has been the accepted theory that Captain Jones of the *Mayflower* was bribed by the Dutch to prevent the Pilgrims from landing in the vicinity of the Hudson River, but this suspicion rests solely on the statement of Nathaniel Morton in his Memorial—"That they (the Dutch) had fraudulently hired the said Jones for this purpose." In a note he makes the positive assertion "of this plot between the Dutch and Mr. Jones I have late and certain intelligence." The source of "this late and certain intelligence" has never come to light. The assertion rests on one man's judgment of the value of this intelligence. Morton's Memorial was written 50 years after the landing of the Pil-

grims, and it is supposed that he obtained his information from his friend Thomas Willet, who had access to the Dutch archives. Sir Ferdinando Gorges has also been suspected of conspiracy with the commander of the *Mayflower*, and certainly his early education had not failed to teach him that bribery was legitimate and almost a virtue.

Admitting, however, that the captain might have been bribed by the Dutch, this would not preclude the possibility of his being bribed also by Sir Ferdinando, and we must consider how much more valuable the result of this supposed bribery would have been to Gorges than to the Dutch.

No documents or letters have been discovered, so far as I have any knowledge, showing any correspondence between Sir Ferdinando Gorges and the Pilgrims, but there are a few established facts which indicate that there may have been some private understanding between some of the English partners and Sir Ferdinando, and this complete silence on his part, for which there were some very adequate reasons, is in itself suspicious.

In 1619–20 the Puritan party in England had become very strong. The Reform Parliament was almost a Puritan Parliament, for the ghost of Essex was there demanding reparation and reprisal upon Sir Ferdinando Gorges. If the King had not dissolved that Parliament, Sir Ferdinando would have suffered severely in his rights and privileges in the New World, but enough had been accomplished to make him recognize that the past was not forgotten.

Although the Pilgrims or Separatists were only a very small part of the Puritan party, nevertheless they were Puritans, and if it were known that Gorges was attempting to influence them to settle under his charter undoubtedly it would have encountered bitter opposition, and consequently any correspondence or understanding necessarily would have been well guarded.

Sir Ferdinando Gorges must have known all about the negotiations which had been carried on for about three years between the South Virginia Company or London Company and the Pilgrims. Among his sources of information was John Gorges, his eldest son, who had married a daughter of the Countess of Lincoln, who took a decided interest in American colonization; moreover the second patent from the South Virginia Company to the Pilgrims was taken out in the name of John Whincop, a member of the family of the Countess of Lincoln.

It is certainly reasonable to suppose that Sir Ferdinando Georges, knowing the character and standing of the body of men who proposed to establish a colony in the New World, would have had them settle in that territory which came under his charter, and there are a few facts which indicate that there may have been some private understanding between some of the leaders and Sir Ferdinando.

November 10 or 11, 1620, the Pilgrims sighted Cape Cod. On the 11th, only a few hours afterwards, even before they landed, the memorable Compact was drawn up. The preamble follows: "Having undertaken for the glorie of God and advancemente of the Christian faith and honor to our King and countrie a voyage to plant the first colonie in the northern parts of Virginia." This seems to permit a possible understanding with the North Virginia Company, and that New England had been considered before the departure from England or Holland. And Winslow writes in his brief Relation, referring to the first plans of the Pilgrims, "for our eye was upon the most northern parts of Virginia."

If, as it is supposed, the Pilgrims, many months before they left England, had decided to plant their colony near the Hudson River, it seems almost inconceivable that such men as Bradford, Winslow, and Standish would so suddenly have changed their preconceived plans, unless a settlement on the Massachusetts coast had previously been considered. It is certainly not consistant with their known characters. A settlement near the Hudson River would have been in the South Virginia territory.

Almost immediately after it was known that the landing had been made at Plymouth, a patent was issued to them by Sir Ferdinando Georges without, so far as is known, any previous attempt to discuss conditions or privileges, and was immediately accepted by the settlers. And the question still arises, when did Governor Bradford first see that letter written by Dermer to his "honored friend?"

No doubt can exist that the Pilgrims were well acquainted with Capt. John Smith's glowing description of New England and of that part of the coast where they had first landed, and that they had his map to consult. Also without doubt they knew of Champlain's, Pring's and Gosnold's descriptions, and probably had seen the letter of Capt. Thomas Dermer to Samuel Purchase.

Is it unreasonable to suppose that Capt. Thomas Dermer was on the Massachusetts coast and at Plymouth for some definite object only a short time before the Pilgrims' expected landing? It certainly would have been a wise move of Sir Ferdinando Gorges to have one of his captains ready to meet them, or to try to intercept them on their approach to this country. He would have been able to give them all the advantage of his knowledge and experience.

If it had not been for unforseen accident, Capt. Thomas Dermer undoubtedly would have met the Pilgrims on their arrival at Cape Cod, and they, judging from their attempts to find a suitable harbor, would gladly have accepted any guidance, even if unexpected, and Dermer undoubtedly would have taken them to Plymouth, the place where he had expressed a wish that "the first plantation might hear be seated."

Taking into consideration that for 14 years, ever since 1606, Sir Ferdinando Gorges had attempted unsuccessfully to settle a colony under the North Virginia charter, would he not have used all the means in his power to establish this Plymouth colony? The project had been considered in England and Holland for three years. He knew the standing and the character of the men who composed it, and who proposed to make this settlement. He knew that their chief aim was not wealth but to secure a permanent home. And would he not most naturally have attempted to influence their leaders or put in their way the means of going? For two years he had been planning just such an enterprise. He had already been much influenced by Capt. John Smith's glowing accounts of Massachusetts, and now Dermer supplemented Smith's story. Pring and Gosnold had told their tales of the country in the vicinity of Cape Cod, and had brought back most substantial results. Sir Ferdinando Gorges had in his possession much valuable information to give to the Pilgrims, and he without doubt took measures to have them receive all the information possible. Champlain's and Smith's maps had both been published, and both described Plymouth Harbor minutely.

If there was any understanding with Sir Ferdinando Gorges, the scheme was almost frustrated by an encounter with the Indians on the Isle of Capawick, where Dermer was so severely wounded that he was obliged to go immediately to Virginia. There he shortly afterwards died from his wounds. But the captain and pilot of the *Mayflower* remained, and Squanto; and if the officers of the ship had been bribed by Gorges to land the Pilgrims on the Massachusetts coast in the vicinity of Cape Cod, Sir Ferdinando would have given them all necessary information that he had received from Dermer in regard to Cape Cod Bay.

Governor Bradford tells us that "on the 6th. of December they sent out their shallop again, intending to circulate that deep bay of Cape Cod," and their pilot, a Mr. Coppin was with them. After thus spending two days "they decided to hasten to a place that their pillot did assure them was a good harbor" of which he had knowledge "and they might fetch it before night." About the middle of the afternoon he told them he saw the harbor, but in encountering the storm the mast of the boat was broken and when finally approaching the entrance to Plymouth Harbor, obscurely seen through the darkness and the storm, Governor Bradford writes that Coppin suddenly exclaimed, "the Lord be merciful unto them for his eyes had never seen that place before," but half blinded by the night and the tempest he probably was himself deceived. He had recognized the harbor only a few hours before the approach of the storm, and it was the only harbor which he could "fetch" in the time he himself had specified. If he was following any instructions or guidance received

before he left England, he certainly had followed them, for he brought the Pilgrims to the exact spot selected by Dermer for a "first colony to be established on the Massachusetts coast," and Dermer had so written to those most interested in this colonization. Call it coincidence if you will, but it was very fortunate for Sir Ferdinando Gorges.

Two months afterwards, when the Pilgrims first met Massasoit at Plymouth, they were met by his two messengers, Samoset and Squanto, with the first cordial greeting of the New World to the Old World, "Welcome Englishman."

I can not claim that Sir Ferdinando Gorges was the father of Plymouth, but he had provided for her a habitation, he had provided for her nurses, and I believe he was the consultant physician before her birth.[1]

---

[1] I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to James Phinney Baxter for information derived from his "Sir Ferdinando Gorges and his Province of Maine," published by The Prince Society in 1890, and to Worthington C. Ford for information derived from his notes in "The History of Plymouth Plantation," published by the Massachusetts Historical Society in 1912.

XI. CAPITALISTIC AND SOCIALISTIC TENDENCIES IN THE PURITAN COLONIES

By CLIVE DAY

Yale University

CAPITALISTIC AND SOCIALISTIC TENDENCIES IN THE PURITAN COLONIES

By Clive Day

If the Pilgrim of 300 years ago could return to life and survey the activities of the present world, what change would strike him most, what features of our life would be to him least intelligible? Human nature, in the individual, is much the same. He would not agree with our theology, and would differ with us on points of ethics, but he would be well prepared to dispute the points of difference with us, and might possibly be able to give us advice that would be to our advantage. Our politics would seem to him not very different from his; would seem, maybe, not very much better. Our system of social classes has altered in some respects, but it remains still much like that in which he lived. Some of our attainments, notably in the arts and sciences, would indeed astonish him. But that aspect of our life which would most surprise him when he saw its superficial manifestations, and would most perplex him when he sought to understand its operation, would be, I feel sure, our material civilization. Even when he had become used to the externals—the food and drink and clothing and housing; the omnipresent engine, whether steam or gasoline or electric, and the inevitable machine operated by it—he would find himself at the threshold of a deeper problem. It would be his task, namely, to understand an organization far more elaborate and delicate than any machine, the organization of the human beings by whom and for whom the machines are run. The simple system of economic cooperation which prevailed in England, or Holland, or America in the seventeenth century would scarcely suggest to him the intricacies of the present system. Nor could he turn to Aristotle for enlightenment, as he might still in a matter of ethics or politics. Economics is still a young science.

Imagine now the amazement of our Pilgrim when he is assured that he bears a share of personal responsibility for these changes in economic life; that he, as a Puritan, was an important contributor to the process of economic revolution. Such is the suggestion soberly advanced by a German scholar of standing, Max Weber, who until his death this past year was professor at Heidelberg. He follows

back the line of development which has led to our present elaborate organization, and his path takes him to early Massachusetts. I do not follow him in his conclusions, as will appear in the course of this paper. To understand his argument, and to criticize it effectively, we must first review the general subject of capitalism, the subject to which he and other German scholars have devoted so much attention in recent years.

"Capitalism" is a vague term, yet I think its meaning is sufficiently obvious for present purposes.[1] It implies a dominance at the present time of capital, just as we might use the terms feudalism or terrorism to suggest the dominance of some other element at another time. It is, I believe, the best word that we can use to characterize the present stage of industrial progress. The whole material equipment of our civilization is capital. Our activities are regulated, to a considerable degree determined, by capitalists. The share of enjoyment that each of us gets from life comes to him not as the immediate product of his own exertions, but as a complex of the products and services of other people; and on every path that leads from producer to consumer stands the capitalist. It is he, more than any other individual, who has made the economic world what it is to-day.

We sometimes refer to the present period as the age of machinery, and the term is sufficiently accurate if we seek merely to describe the technical processes of production. It is superficial and misleading when applied to the vital processes of our economic life. The machines that we see all about us have not grown up of themselves. They have been invented and constructed to the order of the capitalist. They did not make him; he made them.

The Germans are right, therefore, when they have fixed on capitalism as the distinctive mark of our present industrial organization, and they have done good service to history when they have directed attention to the problem of the origins of capitalism. They have followed bold methods in their inquiries, and have propounded conclusions of which some have already been disproved. I shall not enter on the large questions involved, but must sketch briefly their formulation of the problem, to illustrate these methods and at the same time to introduce properly the particular question of the contribution of the Puritan colonies to the capitalistic movement.

The problem of the origin of capitalism is in their view twofold. It involves, first, a study of the conditions of society at any period. Was there in existence a fund of money sufficient to make possible

[1] In recent years protests have been made against the loose use of the term "capitalism," which indeed has been applied by different authors in very different meanings. Compare articles by Passow in *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie*, October, 1916, vol. 107, p. 433 ff., by Diehl in Schmoller's *Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung*, 1920, vol. 44, p. 203 ff. It seems unnecessary to seek here to refine the concept.

its active circulation? Were contracts in terms of money facilitated by the effective administration of a rather advanced code of law? Was there a considerable group of dependent laborers, the germ of the later "proletariat," forced to seek a livelihood by working for others? These questions suggest a group of conditions, some of them external and material, all of them more or less objective and unconscious, which must be satisfied before capitalism in its present form could develop. But alone by themselves these conditions do not create capitalism. They make it possible, but not necessary. Capitalism as a living institution must wait until the capitalist himself appears.

There is, therefore, another set of conditions, termed subjective, which must be satisfied before the *idea* of capitalism springs up, before individuals see the opportunity, cast off the inherited notions which would hamper them in exploiting it, and by their success make the idea of capitalism current, and found a class of capitalists. According to this view the capitalist proper is as different from the individual human beings of a preceding period as is the capitalistic society from the simpler society out of which it grew. Let us consider for a moment the typical characteristics of the present-day capitalist as they are presented in Sombart's analysis.[2]

First of all, he must have the qualities of the successful *entrepreneur*, of the man who will undertake great things and who can execute them. He must be an organizer, able to judge men and to coordinate their activities to advance his own ends; he must be a bargainer, with the instinct for making money out of every contract; he must be a conqueror, with ambitious aims and the persistence that does not accept defeat. And he must be something more than all these things. Qualities such as those indicated are dangerously egoistic. They promise, to an individual or a class, a brilliant career, but threaten a short one. They must be balanced by some element which will reduce the strain of motives and will stabilize the capitalist's activities. Such an element Sombart finds in what he calls the bourgeois or middle-class virtues as they are displayed in the life of the conservative business man, the good citizen, the prudent father of a family. Benjamin Franklin is a type of this class; Poor Richard's Almanac is the bible from which its texts are taken.

The capitalist spirit, it will be noted, is a complex of different and contrasting elements. Like other historical phenomena, it must have been the product of slow growth. It must have grown up in a hostile atmosphere. Anything so new and strange as this combination would surely be opposed by all the traditions of a society clinging to its past. The investigator who seeks the origin of the capitalist spirit

[2] This summary follows Werner Sombart, Der Bourgeois, Leipzig, 1913, which has been translated by M. Epstein under the title "The Quintessence of Capitalism." Sombart reproduces these views with no great change in the revised edition of Der Moderne Kapitalismus, vol. 1 (1916), p. 322 ff., p. 836 ff.

must explain how the elements that composed it were supplied, and particularly how they were protected in their development by the very society which they were destined eventually to destroy.

Here we come at last to the Puritan, who has been kept so long in the background of this paper. In the religious beliefs and the ethical principles of Protestant sects Weber finds one of the essential sources of the capitalist spirit. He finds the germs of the capitalist spirit long before capitalism itself developed. In the southern colonies of America, in spite of the fact that they were founded by men of property for purposes of gain, he finds the capitalist spirit far less developed than in Massachusetts, which was founded for religious reasons by ministers and college graduates, by simple artisans and yeomen. The capitalist spirit developed there just because it was sheltered by the shield of religion.[3]

The Puritan doctrine, according to this view, harmonized the quest of profit with the quest of God, and gave an ethical basis to the economic standard of worldly success. It did not condemn riches as such, or the pursuit of riches. Riches were, indeed, a danger by inviting to repose, but became an evil only when they were enjoyed. Spending, the enjoyment of wealth, became a vice; saving, the employment of wealth to get more wealth, became a virtue. Is not that, we are asked, the very essence of capitalism?

The particular doctrine of the Puritans which Weber most stresses as a root of the capitalist spirit is the doctrine of the "calling." This gave an ethical, even a religious, basis to the precept that man on earth must not merely work hard; he must work profitably. A few extracts from Baxter's Christian Directory will illustrate the position.[4]

> It is for *Action* that God *maintaineth us* and our *abilities*: *work* is the *moral* as well as the *natural* End of *power*. . . . It is *Action* that God is most served and honored by. . . . If God shew you a way in which you may lawfully get more than in another way, (without wrong to your soul or to any other) if you refuse this and choose the less gainful way, you cross one of the ends of your Calling, and you refuse to be God's Steward, and to accept his gifts, and use them for him when he requireth it: You may labour to be *Rich for God*, though not for the *flesh* and sin.

---

[3] Max Weber, "Die protestantische Ethik and der 'Geist' des Kapitalismus," Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft (1905), vol. 20, pp. 1–54, vol. 21, pp. 1–110. An article by P. T. Forsyth, "Calvinism and capitalism," Contemporary Review (1910), vol. 97, pp. 728–741, vol. 98, pp. 74–87, was stimulated by Weber and reproduces many of his views.

[4] Richard Baxter, A Christian Directory: or a Summ of Practical Theologie and Cases of Conscience. Second edition, London, 1678, folio, Tome 1, ch. 10, pt. 1, p. 376 ff., "Direction about our Labour and Callings." Another exposition of this view occurs in an anonymous pamphlet, "Truth, a letter to the gentlemen of Exchange Alley," London, 1733. It is a vice, says the author, to detest and refuse riches. I cite in modernized spelling. "For this is refusing the means and the opportunities of doing good, and putting it out of a man's power to practice many excellent and beneficial virtues. There needs but little consideration to convince us, that the using riches as one ought, and getting an absolute dominion over them is a task much more laborious and difficult than the being content under the want of them; and a prudent and virtuous behaviour in poverty is more attainable than a steady goodness in the midst of plenty." The dedicatory epistle of the pamphlet is signed by F. G., F. R. S., but I find no one with the initials F. G. listed as a member of the Royal Society at the time.

I shall not stop to review the criticisms which Weber's work has called forth from continental scholars. I shall leave aside the questions first whether the doctrine of the "calling" of English nonconformers was peculiar to them, and secondly, whether the aspect of it which I have sketched was really characteristic of them. I shall confine myself to a statement of what I have found in the history of the Puritan colonies.

The sources which I have consulted fall, for the most part, into two categories—sermons and laws. To the sermons of the time I look for an expression of the ethical ideals proclaimed by the spiritual leaders of the people for the guidance of their flocks.[5] In the laws we find a record of the attempts to bring to practical realization such ideals as might be imposed in the form of rules by sovereign authority.

Let us consider that document absurdly advertised as "the first sermon preached in New England,"[6] which certainly was printed in England in 1622 and which purports to be a discourse delivered at Plymouth in New England in 1621. Whether or not the tradition is well founded that ascribes it to Robert Cushman, and fixes the spot in Plymouth where he preached in November or December, 1621, the document is certainly a good source for the study of Puritanism in the Pilgrim colony. To those who seek there the germs of the capitalist spirit the sermon gives cold comfort. It is entitled "The Sin and Danger of Self-Love." It is based on a text from the first epistle to the Corinthians, "Let no man seek his own: But every man another's wealth." These points are not in themselves decisive, for it is of the essence of Weber's argument that concealed under such banners as these the capitalistic spirit was going forth to conquer. Let us therefore look further in the sermon, seeking particularly the Puritan doctrine of the "calling." We find, indeed, a reference to it, when Paul is quoted as criticizing "such as were negligent in their labors and callings." But the point of Paul's criticism, as it appeared to the preacher, was the effect of negligence in limiting charity, its reaction on the consumption of wealth, not on production. The very first to be condemned by the preacher among those who "seek their own" are "such as are covetous, seek their own by seeking riches, wealth, money." The sermon indeed introduces a distinction. "Here is the difference between a covetous worldling and an honest, thrifty Christian; it is lawful sometimes for men to gather wealth, and grow rich, even as there was a time for Joseph to store up corn; but a godly and sincere Christian will see when this time is, and will not hoard up when he seeth others of his brethren and associates to want."

[5] Of the sermons I should estimate that I have consulted several score, but have kept no exact record. Most of them yield nothing for the purpose in view, and I have not attempted to examine even all of those in the Yale Library.

[6] Self-Love, by Robert Cushman, 1621, reprinted by Comstock, New York, 1847.

That is the gist of the sermon on this crucial issue. A man may lawfully gather riches, but nowhere is he exhorted so to do, and the general attitude of the preacher toward those who seek wealth is openly contemptuous. "The greatest scratchers and scrapers and gatherers of riches" are fools.

In the later literature of the Puritans in America, I find, indeed, some doctrines which lend themselves more readily to the support of Weber's view that qualities destined to further the development of a capitalist society were being fostered by religious teaching in the Colonies.

The most complete and systematic treatment of the doctrine of the calling which I have found is contained in the "Compleat Body of Divinity" of Samuel Willard, pastor of the South Church in Boston and vice president of Harvard College.[7] There one finds a detailed discussion not only of the "effectual calling," a theological mystery with which we have nothing to do, but also of the "general calling" in the service of God, and the "particular calling" which treats "the lawful procuring and furthering of our own and our Neighbour's Wealth or outward estate," the "way to prosperity." I will cite a few passages to illustrate his point of view; they are the more significant because Willard is seeking to justify in connection with them the practice of loans at interest.

> God hath given to Men their Estates for their outward Benefits. . . . There is therefore an Honest Gain to be moderately sought in the Improvement of such Estates. . . . It is true, our prosperity depends upon God's Favour; but we are to seek it in the Use of *Man's* and that is by *Improvement*; for these are perishable things, and will, without such Care and Endeavour go to decay, as common Experience will daily teach us. That therefore which I shall only here assert in general is, that meerly to advance our Estate by the *turning* of it, is not in itself a *Sin*, but a *Duty* to endeavour it; and that there is an Honest way so to do, and this may be in a Lawful Calling.[8]

The only sermon devoted to this subject, which I have found, is contained in Cotton Mather's "Two brief Discourses. One directing a Christian in his General Calling; Another directing him in his Personal Calling," printed at Boston in 1701. Every Christian has "a *Personal Calling*; or, a certain *Particular Employment* by which his *Usefulness* in his Neighborhood is distinguished," and which must not be allowed to encroach on the duties of his general calling. Every one, even a gentleman, should show a calling; it should be legitimate, agreeable, and entered on with a suitable disposition; every Christian

[7] A Compleat Body of Divinity in two hundred and fifty expository lectures on the Assembly's Shorter Catechism, by the Reverend & Learned Samuel Willard, Boston, 1726, folio. The lectures are dated, and those which I cite were written, 1704-1705. It is worth noting that I have examined a number of Willard's separate sermons without finding in them anything more on the subject; this and other negative evidence make it a fair presumption that the subject was not a "live" one at the time.

[8] P. 699, May 29, 1705.

should be able to give a good account not only of his particular occupation but also of what he amounts to in it. He should mind his occupation with industry, discretion, honesty, contentment and piety.

Samuel Willard and Cotton Mather are authorities of the first importance by reason of their high position in the world of their time and the extent of their influence. Do their doctrines which I have briefly sketched, support Weber's contention that the Puritan moralists made it not only man's right but also his duty to acquire wealth? I think that they do. Neither in these authors nor in any others of the period have I found such open exhortations to get rich as appear in Baxter and other English sources. The preachers stress, rather, the other side of the subject, that it is improper to grow poor. They condemn the vices that lead to that result, and urge the corresponding virtues that lead to prosperity and riches, without attending very much to the results on a man's personal fortunes. The parable of the talents is often on their lips. "Let your *Business* Engross the *Most* of your Time," wrote Cotton Mather. "Avoid all impertinent *Avocations*. Laudable *Recreations* may be used now and then: But, I beseech you, Let those Recreations be used for *Sawce* but not for *Meat*."[9] "Idleness is a sinful waste of our Time," wrote Timothy Dwight[10] at the close of the colonial period. "Prodigality is another Fraud, of the same general nature." By both of these vices property is effectually wasted."

Certain qualifications are to be noted, affecting the importance which we may ascribe to these doctrines as the germs of a later capitalism. In the first place these teachings take a subordinate place in the sermons of the period. Industry and thrift, to be sure, are frequently referred to as commonplace virtues, the propriety of which may be taken for granted; and the German scholar might urge that this fact proves his contention, and that Puritanism had established its standards. It appears to me, rather, that the preacher had found that self-interest was sufficient stimulant to urge men to economic exertion; and he sought to direct men's minds to things above them rather than to things around them. Whatever be the explanation, the doctrine of the calling, in the particular not the general sense, receives at best no more than a bare reference in sermons which I have seen, aside from that of Cotton Mather, and is not treated at all in Dwight's Theology. One seeks it in vain in sermons whose titles seem to promise some economic philosophy, such as Cotton Mather's "The Serviceable Man," 1690; Solomon Stoddard's "God's Frown in the Death of Usefull Men," 1703; Samuel Whitman's "Practical Godliness the Way to Prosperity," 1714.

---

[9] Two Discourses, p. 49.

[10] Theology; explained and defended in a series of sermons. Middletown, 1818, vol. 4, p. 229, p 282.

Another point to be noticed is the conflict between the encouragement of the accumulation of riches, as expressed in extracts quoted above, and the social philosophy of the Puritans. The class distinctions which they brought with them from England tended to grow weaker, but did not disappear, and were in fact supported by the influence of the ministers. They discourage any seeking after social advancement, and preached contentment in the station in which a man found himself. So Timothy Cutler, in his election sermon at Hartford, 1717, on "The Firm Union of a People," urged the need of "compactness," that every man should keep within the limits of his sphere and station; and Benjamin Colman, preaching the election sermon at Boston the next year, required that "Every one is to act *in his own place*, studying to be quiet and to do his own business, in the Relation Trust and Office which the governing Providence of God assigns him."

Finally, we must inquire into the relation of some of the moral doctrines which we have been considering to the practical policy adopted by the community in the form of laws, and the relation of both doctrine and policy to the material conditions of life. May it not be that some of the precepts which I have quoted were inculcated not so much because the people were Puritans as because they were colonists? This I believe to have been the case.

In one sense the colonists were without question capitalistically inclined—in the sense, namely, that their stock of capital was desperately small, and that they must strive in every way to further its maintenance and its increase. When we study, however, the ways that they chose to further these ends, we find a curious contrast; these ways were distinctly socialistic. I have not in mind here the ill-fated communistic experiment in early Plymouth. There was no attempt later to depart so far from individualism. Samuel Willard, at the end of the seventeenth century, was able to justify private property by reference to all law, both human and divine. Private property was recognized, but its social bearings were emphasized as they have never been in our later life. Capital was wanted, not for the individual who might possess it, but for the group who might benefit by its employment; and the use of capital was closely restricted to serve social ends.

The Pilgrim's compact of 1620, or John Winthrop's Modell of Christian Charity of 1630, show a consciousness of the superiority of the interests of the group above the interests of any individual which was realized so far as practicable in later economic legislation. Acts fixing the wages which artizans might demand were common in the early history of the Puritan colonies, and though they show a few traces of class interests, appear to have been in general an honest attempt to regulate the economic relations of individuals for the ben-

efit of the whole society. When the failure of these general acts, whether administered by the colonial or by a local body, was realized, the government confined its activities to the punishment of individual cases of extortion, and to the regulation of specific trades. Attempts to fix the price of bread were made and abandoned, but regulation of bakers' charges, expressed in an assize of bread, was widespread and was carried out in practice. The Selectmen's Records and the Town Records of Boston show that the assize of bread was enforced in that town through the later seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries.[11]

Attempts to fix by law prices in exchanges were also common in the early period. They were likewise soon abandoned, but the motive behind them expressed itself in a great variety of legislation designed to protect the interests of the group from the selfishness of individuals. The establishment of markets was a device to bring together buyers and sellers in such numbers that a fair market price might be fixed and that the individual might thereby be protected from the oppression to which his ignorance or weakness might otherwise expose him.

In most cases the market appears to have resulted in nothing more than this regular concourse of people seeking to trade with each other, but in some cases it became an elaborate institution, with regular officials to enforce the medieval rules against forestalling, engrossing, and regrating. This was notably the case in Boston, where the question of market regulations became in the eighteenth century a political issue, and led to open riot.[12] Timothy Dwight, writing of the period shortly after 1800, thought that the greatest evil from which the inhabitants of New Haven suffered was the want of a regular market system.[13]

For a supply of the necessary provisions the people relied as a rule on individual traders attracted to the market. The colony, and sometimes the town, imposed restrictions on the export of wares which might be wanted by the consumers of the community; and often imposed an embargo on the shipment of provisions, to protect the consumer from the selfish interest of the producer seeking his best market. Measures of this kind were not always sufficient to satisfy the demand for protection. Cotton had proposed in 1641 that each town should have its own public grain store,[14] and this

[11] The assize of bread was established in Massacusetts by an act of 1646, and was put under control of the towns in 1681, Records of Massachusetts Bay, 2:181, 5:322. Boston administered the assize more or less strictly from 1682 to 1801. There are scattered references to the assize in other New England towns, but it does not seem to have been administered systematically in any of them.

[12] Boston is in this regard again peculiar in the determination which it showed in attempting to carry into effect the market rules of the me ieval town; the question of the market runs through many volumes of the town's records.

[13] Travels in New England, I: 194.

[14] Hutchinson Papers, Albany, 1865, I: 189.

form of "town trading," to use the modern phrase, was practiced on an elaborate scale in Boston in the eighteenth century. A bread riot in that town in 1713 appears to have been the occasion of the system by which the town government purchased grain from public funds and distributed it at a price set to check exorbitant demands on the part of private sellers. The town records show that this system was in regular operation in the town down to the Revolution.[15]

The clearest example of the strong tendency to socialize private capital appears in the public position given the gristmill. In the earliest period the Indian corn which formed the staple food was pounded in a samp mortar, or ground in a hand mill, "quarn," by a laborious process. Bradford says that the Pilgrims pounded their corn for many years. So great, however, were the hardships of this process that the colonists made every effort to obtain a power mill driven by water or by wind. The town sometimes established the mill as a public undertaking, sometimes enlisted private enterprise by offering assistance or by promising a limited monopoly. The mill enjoyed, in any event, a practical monopoly. The miller of a town had the people at his mercy. He could charge what rates he pleased. We find early established, therefore, the doctrine that the mill, even though it were a purely private undertaking, could operate only under conditions laid down by law for the protection of customers. To use the later language of the law, it was "private property affected to a public use," and, like the grain elevators or the railroads of recent times, it was socialized, and it must grind well and duly for specified rates of toll. The struggles of the town with its gristmill present in miniature all the troubles that the Nation was later to undergo in dealing with the railroads—the failure of competition, the inadequacy of regulation, recourse in some cases to municipal ownership as the avenue of escape.[16]

---

[15] A committee appointed in 1774 to inquire into the operation of the granary recommended that it be closed, Town Records, Reports, vol. 18, pp. 156, 170. The building was let to a private person in 1786, Selectmen's Records, Reports, vol. 25, p. 324.

[16] The problem of just price, the rate at which a man may properly exchange his goods or services, is not infrequently raised in the doctrinal literature of the colonial period, but the writers are evidently dependent on the canonist doctrines which tradition had bequeathed to them, and make no original contribution on this puzzling question. Even while they recognized the practical difficulties in the way of establishing the just price in a concrete case they believed that at least some prices could be shown to be unjust; and the courts punished individual cases of extortion.

With regard to the loan at interest, the Puritans reflected the view then prevailing in England, that interest was legitimate, but that it should not be excessive, and that Christian charity required that it be altogether remitted in case of need. Cotton proposed in 1641 a positive law forbidding interest on a loan to a poor brother, but the statutes actually adopted merely set a limit to the rate. The Massachusetts act of 1693 expressly excepted transactions in bottomry and foreign exchange, in which the competition of business men might be expected to establish a fair rate. On the whole, however, the colonial usury laws seem to have been designed to lower the rate of interest, to the advantage of the borrower. The colonial community felt a sore need of capital to develop the new country, and passed laws which by discouraging the capitalist may have actually defeated the end in view. Evasion was, however, so easy that the matter is of theoretical rather than of practical importance.

The conclusions of this study in the capitalistic tendencies of the Puritan colonies may be summarized as follows: Puritan religious doctrines did lend themselves, by their insistence on industry and thrift, to the process of saving, which is essential to the accumulation of capital. The spiritual leaders of the people appear, however, to have aid but little emphasis on the doctrine of the "calling," and to have allowed it to drop far into the background of their interests. The strength of their appeal for saving was derived not from ethical or religious doctrines, but from the practical needs of a society in a colonial environment. Capital was wanted for social ends; its accumulation was rigidly governed by precepts and by laws opposing its employment to further selfish interests. The spirit of the Puritan colonies was, on the whole, rather socialistic than capitalistic.

XII. THE HERITAGE OF THE PURITANS

By DAVID SAVILLE MUZZEY
Columbia University

THE HERITAGE OF THE PURITANS

By David Saville Muzzey

Anniversaries are dangerous. They often tempt to the pious exaggeration of panegyric. As the lamp beneath the retort liberates from certain chemical substances a roseate cloud of vapor, so the flame of patriotism or filial pride warms the heart of orator or poet until it expands and overflows in language that can hardly bear the acid test of historical criticism. Daniel Webster, at Plymouth Rock 100 years ago, praised the spot as that "where Christianity, civilization, and letters made their first lodgment in a vast extent of country"; and 23 years later, at a dinner of the New England Society at the old Astor House in New York, he spoke of "the free nature of our institutions and the popular form of those governments which have come down to us from the Rock of Plymouth." Yet Daniel Webster knew that more than a decade before the Pilgrims landed Christianity and civilization had made a permanent lodgment on the banks of the James, and that more than a year before the *Mayflower* sighted the shores of Cape Cod 22 burgesses from the plantations and hundreds of the Virginia colony had met in the rude church at Jamestown as the first representative body on American soil, the prototype and promise of our "free institutions and popular forms of government." In his Robinson of Leyden, Oliver Wendell Holmes sang of the Pilgrim Fathers:

> And these were they who gave us birth,
> The Pilgrims of the sunset wave,
> Who won for us this virgin earth,
> And freedom with the land they gave.

The meter and the rhyme are faultless, but the lines will not bear the scrutiny of the historian. The Pilgrims did not give us birth, unless by "us" Doctor Holmes means "us descendants of the Pilgrims." And as for winning for us this virgin earth, what of the long procession of explorers, missionaries, traders, pioneers who file in a great pageant before our eyes with their faces toward the sunset! Did the French "coureurs" pass through Plymouth, or the Germans

of the Schuylkill and the Juniata, or the Scotch-Irish of the Shenandoah, or the Huguenots of Carolina? Did the men of the western waters carry faces bronzed by the sun and salt of Cape Cod Bay, or were Radisson, La Salle, Daniel Boone, and George Rogers Clark sons of the Pilgrims? Yet it has been too common to indulge in such poetical or rhetorical extravagances from the seventeenth century, when Nathaniel Morton in his New England Memorial saw in the Puritans the vine of Psalm lxxx which God had planted in the wilderness and caused to take deep root and fill the land, to the twentieth century, when Theodore Roosevelt at the laying of the corner stone of the Provincetown Monument said: "The coming hither of the Pilgrims three centures ago shaped the destinies of this continent."

In attempting to estimate our heritage from the Puritans I would not prejudice my case by assuming that they were the sole testators of our country's blessings; nor would I, like Palfrey and other pious New England historians (whatever secret satisfaction I may take in my New England birth and blood), maintain that all that the Puritans bequeathed was good. Their shortcomings have received ample attention. From the coarse ridicule of Butler's Hudibras to Macaulay's stately persiflage in the essay on Milton; from Maverick's courteous declaration of grievances and Roger Williams's stubborn eristics to the delicious satire of the Deacon's One Hoss Shay, all the changes have been rung on the Puritan's defects—his intolerance, his sourness, his hypocrisy, his inhumanity, his conceit, his censoriousness, and so on through the appalling list, down to his ridiculous aversion to mince pies and beer at the Christmas season. And, indeed, there is something uncongenial, to say the least, in the atmosphere of the seventeenth century Puritan. Take Judge Samuel Sewall, for instance, as we see him in his diary—now spending his Christmas in the "awful but pleasing diverson" of arranging the coffins in the family vault, now endeavoring to terrify his young son into a premature experience of grace by strong representations of hell-fire, now pressing the courtship for his third marriage with a slyly amorous pomposity. You and I to-day would not feel any live spirit of "camaraderie" with a seventeenth-century Puritan, for it is a difficult thing to establish a common ground of friendly intercourse with a man who thinks that you are wallowing in original sin. But after all, much of the impatient disgust with the Puritans (like that which found expression in the remark attributed sometimes to an Anglican bishop and sometimes to an Oxford don, namely, that he wished that Plymouth Rock had landed on the Pilgrims), is due to our applying twentieth-century tastes and standards to seventeenth-century men. I imagine that it would be uncongenial also for most of us to associate with a courtier of King James.

Indeed, the application of that elementary but oft-neglected canon of historical criticism, namely, contemporaneity, while by no means freeing the Puritan from all of his unloveliness, would go far toward a proper appreciation of the motives from which he acted. If we saw the difficulties and perils of his situation with the same promptness with which we detect the eccentricities of his character, there would be little danger of our sharing Chesterton's opinion of Puritan New England as "a madhouse where religious maniacs had broken loose and locked up their keepers." Take, for example, the attitude of the Puritan toward the Church of England. To-day, in New England or in any other part of our country, political disqualification or religious persecution of Episcopalians would be bigotry pure and simple. Not so in the troubled decade of the 1630's, when, in John Cotton's virile phrase, "God rocked the three kingdoms" of Britain. The New England Puritans had left their homeland and come to the wilderness not so much to enjoy freedom of worship, as is so frequently stated ("enjoy" being a rather strange word in their vocabulary), as to establish that form of church and magistracy which they believed God laid upon their conscience. They were beset with foes on both sides of the Atlantic, whose purpose was not to secure the admission of the peaceful celebration of the Anglican rites alongside of the sterner Puritan worship, but to destroy the Puritan colony root and branch. Charles I ordered the surrender of the Massachusetts charter in 1634, five years after he had granted it. Sir Ferdinando Gorges, the servant of King Charles, spent his life in the attempt to wreck New England Puritanism. To admit Episcopalians into Massachusetts would not have been simply to tolerate the prayer book and the vestments, but to welcome the political supporters of Charles and Strafford; to make their servants, Mason and Gorges, feel at home; to receive the emissaries of Archbishop Laud, for whom, in Gardiner's classic phrase, the church was not the temple of the Holy Ghost but the palace of an invisible king. To the Puritan the Anglican Church was the palace of a very visible and pestilential king. If Charles and Laud and Gorges had succeeded, there would have been no Puritan New England. You may believe that it would have been better for America if there had been no Puritan New England. "De Gustibus non est disputandum." But it is hardly possible to rejoice in the preservation of Puritan New England and at the same time to blame the Puritans for their self-preservation.

> Intolerant!—They bought
> Their freedom with a price too nobly great
> To lose it lightly. Always in their thought
> A future peril to their children loomed
> With entrance of false doctrine!

It is a "reductio ad absurdum" of the principle of tolerance—as we have had reason to ponder on somewhat deeply in the last few years—to expect any society to admit to its bosom propaganda whose avowed object is its destruction.

You will have noticed that in turning my first page I dropped the Pilgrims and began to speak of the Puritans. And you may have thought on reading the title in the program, "The heritage of the Puritans," that this paper, if read at all, should be postponed to the annual meeting of the association in 1930—when I shall be old and gray. We are well aware, of course, of the distinctions between the Pilgrims and the Puritans—distinctions emphasized in every classroom. Aside from the different circumstances of the migration, there are some notable contrasts (explained to some extent, I believe, by the historical condition to which I have just alluded) in the temper of the settlements. The smaller colony to the south, as we follow its history in the pages of Bradford, did not develop that rigidity which we find among the Massachusetts Puritans. The harshness of the "lord bretheren," as Blackstone calls them, with humorous reference to the "lord bishops," is lacking. Also those unlovely habits of "gathering providences" in the shape of God's retributions and judgments. "This day," writes Increase Mather in his diary on November 17, 1675, "I hear God shot an arrow into the midst of this town. The small pocks is in the ordinary of the sign of the Swan. The Keeper is a drunkard . . . His daughter is attacked to show God's displeasure." When some ships were wrecked on the way from Massachusetts to Connecticut, the clergy of Boston said that it was "a correction from God." But Bradford, commenting on the accident, added: "I dare not be so bould with God's judgments in this kind." This sounds more like John Greenleaf Whittier than like John Endicott. When we compare Bradford's portraiture of the sweet reasonableness of Elder William Brewster with the temper of any of the leaders of the northern colony, we realize that there were real contrasts between the two settlements.

Nevertheless, from the broader historical point of view of the influence of New England Puritanism the differences between the two colonies sink into comparative insignificance. Both came to these shores driven by the same "rude impulse." Three thousand miles of water between them and the motherland made them both "separatists." There was no more thought of establishing even a "purified" Anglicanism among the Boston Pilgrims than there was among the Plymouth Pilgrims. Moreover, both in origin and history the two colonies were closely connected. At least half a dozen members of the Massachusetts Bay Company had been prominent among the adventurers in the Plymouth undertaking. Bradford's History shows on many pages a spirit of cooperation and mutual consideration

between the two settlements in such matters as trade, Indian policy, and the maintenance of independency in the churches. In fact, the union of the two colonies by the royal charter of 1691 was rather the acknowledgment of an accomplished fact than the enforcement of an unwelcome policy. It was not resisted by Plymouth, as the merger with Connecticut had been resisted by New Haven 27 years before.

The mention of the new charter of 1691 suggests a point too seldom given its weight in our estimate of the contribution of the Puritans, namely, that a great change had come over the face of Puritan New England toward the close of the seventeenth century. Prof. Frederick J. Turner in an address before the American Antiquarian Society at Worcester in October 1919, quoted the amusing insolence of the Mayor of Boston to a member of the Harvard corporation in a conversation held in 1916, when his honor declared that "the Irish had letters and learning, culture and civilization, when the forebears of New England were the savage denizens of the Hyperborean forests; that the Irish had made Massachusetts a fit place to live in, and that the New England of the Puritan fathers was as dead as Julius Cæsar." This is not the change that had come over New England by the end of the seventeenth century, but a later transformation. However, if the culture of the Irish had not supplanted the savagery of the descendants of the Hyperborean forests, and if the New England of the Puritans was not as dead as Julius Cæsar in 1700, the actual Puritans of the first generation were as dead as Julius Cæsar. A new generation had grown up in America—a generation that knew of bishops' visitations and gunpowder plots and millenary petitions and the king's dragoons only by hearsay. The children's teeth were not set on edge by the sour grapes their fathers had eaten.

So long as there was any danger that the Stuarts might succeed in destroying their chartered liberties or overthrowing their independent churches, the Puritans naturally maintained their wary and jealous orthodoxy. The accession of William of Orange brought the sense of security that was a prerequisite for a saner political development. And the charter which was issued two years later marks, as well as any single event can mark the beginning of an epoch, the change from an essentially religious to an essentially political New England. Three provisions of the charter put an end to the rule of the saints: (1) Religious toleration was extended to all Christians except Roman Catholics; (2) the suffrage was relieved of all restrictions except a small property qualification; and (3) the governor and a great number of officials became royal appointees. Further evidence of the change in the Puritan character at the close of the

seventeenth century can be seen in the cessation of the witchcraft obsession in 1692 and the expulsion of the Mathers from the control of Harvard College in 1701. Finally, a silent, steady influence had been flowing back upon the old Puritanism from the "outskirts" of its civilization in the frontier settlements, the "mark colonies," the towns of the Connecticut Valley and New Hampshire, for the interesting details of which I must refer you to Professor Turner's paper in the Proceedings of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts for April, 1914. Puritanism here was incidental to the problems of military defense and economic subsistence. The tendency was more toward the Plymouth type of society. The traditional control of the clergy gave way to the influence of those traits which have ever characterized our western pioneers (for the emigrants to the Connecticut Valley were as truly pioneers as the men who crossed the Alleghanies and the Rockies): Namely, individual initiative, resourcefulness, impatience of distant authorities, pragmatic tests of character, secularism, confidence, hard grips with real things. There was little room for the subtleties of theological debate. The trial and condemnation of Mistress Anne Hutchinson at Cambridge (which seems as remote to us as the trial and condemnation of Nestorius at Ephesus) could hardly have been enacted in the Connecticut Valley.

We can read very plainly in the works of Cotton Mather how the secularism of the frontier villages, "on the wrong side of the hedge" as he characterized them, pained the last champion of the old orthodoxy. In his "Frontiers Well Defended" of 1707, Mather goes a "gathering providences" to show God's punishment of secularism. Remember that it was but three years after Hertel de Rouville's band of Indians had swooped down upon Deerfield, massacring 49 men, women, and children, and carrying 111 into captivity. "The unchurched villages," says Mather, "have been utterly broken up by the war, while those with churches regularly formed were under the more sensible protection of Heaven." Needless to say, Mather's report is somewhat marred by "tendency." It is hard to see what "sensible protection" Heaven gave to the Rev. John Williams of Deerfield whose flock was massacred and himself taken captive by the Indians. Nevertheless, Mather's anxiety was well founded. "By the end of the colonial period," says Professor Turner (and the same might be said with almost equal truth of the end of the seventeenth century), "there were two New Englands, the one coastal and dominated by the commercial interests and the established Congregational churches, the other a primitive agricultural area, democratic in principle and not afraid of innovation." In the seventeenth century John Hampden "sought the Lord" on ship money; in the eighteenth, James Otis sought the law on writs of assistance.

It is a distortion of perspective in estimating the heritage of the Puritans—whether we consider the actual expansion of New England into central New York and the old Northwest, or the influence of New England on our political and social institutions—to confine our view, as so many have been tempted to do by the picturesque manifestations of the so-called New England conscience, to the theological and moral aspects of the Puritan régime. The reign of the saints lasted a scant two generations; the influence of socio-political New England has extended over two centuries. It is to two or three of these latter influences that I wish to call your attention in what remains of this paper.

First, and most important, as I think, is the political philosophy of Puritanism. In an age when, acccording to Mr. Wells, the monarchs were exploiting the principles of Machiavelli for the establishment of the "great powers" as transcendant, super-legal states, the Puritan insisted on the primacy of natural, or God-given, rights and the origin of government in a covenant by the people. This, of course, begins in a religious compact after Calvin's teaching, the Bible itself being a convenant (diathêkê, awkwardly translated by the Latin "testamentum") between God and his people. Note the language of the *Mayflower* Compact: "Wee . . . do by these presents solemnly and mutualy in the presence of God and of one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politick for our better ordering and preservation" ; or more fully in the famous Exeter Covenant of 1639: "Wee . . . bretheren of the Church of Exeter, situate and lying upon the river Piscataqua . . . considering with ourselves the holy will of God and our own necessity that we should not live without wholesome laws and government amongst us . . . do in the name of Christ and in the sight of God, combine ourselves together to enact and set up amongst us such government as shall be to our best discovering agreeable to the will of God, professing ourselves subject to our sovereign Lord King Charles, according to the liberties of our English colony of Massachusetts." *In cauda venenum!*

That a handful of men could set up a state "agreeable to the will of God" was a direct corollary to the doctrine that two or three could make a church under the divine diathêkê. And both claims were abhorrent and blasphemous in the eyes of the established powers. If you would realize the vast influence on our history of the remark of John Cotton: "It is evident by the light of nature that all civil relations are founded in covenant," think ahead to the American Revolution, based on the doctrines that governments are made by man and made for man's needs, that the individual is prior to the government and has rights beyond the power of government

to curtail, that all government is restrained by a superior authority, a fundamental law. If you say: "But this is Thomas Jefferson!" I do not deny it. I disclaimed at the beginning of my paper any disposition to attribute to the Puritan a monopoly of political virtue. I would only suggest that Jefferson was a rebel and a radical in Virginia, who broke with the Blairs and the Pendletons and the other "cyphers of aristocracy" as he called them, and went back to the men of Puritan tradition in England, to Milton and Sidney and Locke, for his inspiration. The political philosophy which he had to fight for in Virginia was normal in New England. You would not find any irate, apoplectic Peyton Randolph rushing out into the lobby of the Massachusetts General Court, shouting that he would have given a hundred guineas for the single vote necessary to defeat the resolutions condemning the Stamp Act. When Charles II, just a century earlier, was commending the Virginians as "the best of his distant children" and quartering the arms of the Old Dominion, his commissioners to Massachusetts were flouted as intruders, and his great minister, Clarendon, wrote that the New England colonies were already "hardening into republics." In other colonies there were protests against this or that governor or act or policy, but the very existence of the Puritan governments was a standing protest and a chronic rebellion against hetero-determination. If some modern historians fail to grasp the full significance of this contrast, at least it was distressingly clear to the British Government of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

The source and inspiration of the Puritan's stark philosophy of political self-determination was, as we have seen, the religious doctrine of government by covenant, with its insistence on individual competency (through the illumination of God's will as revealed in the Scriptures) and collective responsibility. The particular agency by which this philosophy was realized in society was the town. The New England town as a kind of cell in our body politic, as a social, religious, and educational unit, is the second contribution of the Puritan to our American democracy that I would emphasize. Of the compact structure of the New England towns, their completeness and self-sufficiency of function, their propagation through a system by which the land of the colony, instead of being sold for revenue or alloted to settlers by "head-rights", was given to groups of men who were responsible for the maintenance of Puritan institutions and the preservation of Puritan ideals, I have not time to speak. You remember the recipe for making a New England town which John Adams gave to Major Langbourne of Virginia: Town meetings, training days, schools, and ministers. At the time of the Stuart Restoration Samuel Butler ridiculed the pretensions of these towns to religious autonomy. New England was:

A commonwealth of Popery,
Where every village is a see
As well as Rome, and must maintain
Its tithe-pig metropolitan.
And every hamlet's governèd
By's Holiness the Church's head,
More haughty and severe in's place
Than Gregory and Boniface.

Their holinesses the Cottons, Wilsons, Mathers, and Shepards had ceased to play the Gregory and Boniface before the generation of Hudibras had passed; but the towns remained keenly conscious of their individual and several responsibility for the preservation of liberty. For example, John Adams's own town of Braintree, Mass., passed resolutions, September 24, 1765, on the occasion of the Stamp Act, to the effect that "We have clear knowledge and a just sense of our rights and liberties, and with submission to Divine Providence we never can be slaves." The protest of a score or two citizens of Braintree was as stately, formal, and considerable in their eyes as the remonstrance of a Continental Congress. A few Sundays later Parson Wibird, as yet somewhat untried, announced as his text: "Hear O heavens, and give ear O earth! I have nourished and brought up children and they have rebelled against me." John Adams, on his front seat, was immediately alert. "I began to suspect a Tory sermon on the times," he writes in his diary, adding with relief, "but the preacher confined himself to spirituals." Here is the "eternal vigilance" which Daniel Webster called "the price of liberty." When the towns of Massachusetts joined forces, they made the toughest web of resistance that ever authority tried to pierce. Thomas Hutchinson said of the Circular Letter of 1768 that it "had a greater tendency toward a revolution in the Government than any preceding measure in any of the Colonies." And Thomas Jefferson's experience in trying to enforce the embargo is well known. "I felt the ground shaken under my feet," he says, "by the actions of the New England town meetings."

It would take us far beyond the limits of our time to describe even in the most cursory manner the influence of the town polity upon the development of our democracy. I would only refer you to the legislation of the Virginia burgesses in 1701, which substituted for the "quasi manorial grants" of the Beverlys, Smiths, and Byrds, as the best way of protecting the frontiers, "settlements like the New England towns;" to the eventual replacement in the Ohio Valley of the large tracts of land sold to speculative companies by a democracy of small landholders; to the general coincidence of the census settlers of New England ancestry with the preponderance of the free-soil vote in the West and Northwest; to the solicitude of the New England

missionaries in the extension of our settlements into Wisconsin, lest the supply of the means of grace might prove "inadequate to the dispersion into remote and still remoter corners of the land." Eventually all the practices of the Puritans, even the most unlovely and inquisitorial, were directed to the noble end of rearing a society of utterly responsible individuals—the only society on which an enduring democracy can rest. For your military power is nothing, your wealth is nothing, your numbers are nothing without the seed from which all greatness come—free and enlightened citizens. Local self-government is the germ cell of democracy. It is of no avail to count our millions if the individuals are ignorant, weak, and venal. Zero multiplied by any conceivable magnitude still results in zero. The so-called democratic empire, like that of Louis Napoleon, is one of the most despicable and dangerous forms of government. There is rhetorical exaggeration, but yet a kernel of profound truth, in the words of Jared Sparks written in 1836: "We owe it to the Puritans that we are not tossed like a shuttlecock from the pikes of an enraged populace to the bayonets of a military police."

So, in the end, our most valuable heritage from the Puritan (and it would be a sort of impiety to conclude my paper without acknowledgment of it) is the emphasis they put upon unremitting education for responsibility. That the education was sought primarily in Holy Scripture by the earlier generation, and that the responsibility was conceived of as a peculiar relation to God, resulted in dogmatism, bigotry, and exclusiveness. But all that, after all, was incidental. More than anything else, intellectual activity works the purgation of its own errors. It is only when thought stops that dogma is fixed. The Puritan educated the individual in order that he might be fit to meet his God in whatever great appointment his God might have for him. For, as Cotton said, "God might enlarge private men with public gift and dispense them to edification." But the mind will not be held in religious or scientific graveclothes when once it has begun to inquire and grow. The Puritans of the seventeenth century would have been scandalized by Emerson and Lowell as the purveyors of "unsound, unsavory, and giddie fancies," like Mistress Anne Hutchinson; yet Emerson and Lowell were their legitimate children. The famous Massachusetts education law of 1647 was passed to circumvent Satan in "one of his chief projects, to keep men from the knowledge of the Scriptures." The preamble to the Massachusetts constitution of 1780 begins: "Wisdom and knowledge, as well as virtue, diffused generally among the body of the people being necessary for the perpetuation of their rights and liberties," etc. To such sane and secular wisdom had the circumvention of Satan led in a century and a half!

I confess that I, for one, am neither sorry to see our attention called back to the Puritans at this time, nor inclined to use the occasion for smart ridicule of the Puritans' peculiar failings. An age which makes a religion of business will naturally look with little sympathy on an age which made a business of religion. And a philosophy that is impatient of absolutisms may need reminding that a thoroughgoing pragmatism would rank a miscarriage of burglary with a misconception of truth. One fault, at least, the Puritan was free from—the fashionable fault of sickness with existence.

> The world for [him] held purport: life [he] wore
> Proudly as kings their solemn robes of state.

XIII. PHILADELPHIA AND THE EMBARGO: 1808

By LOUIS MARTIN SEARS
Purdue University

PHILADELPHIA AND THE EMBARGO: 1808

By Louis Martin Sears

The year of the embargo was critical in the economic history of the United States. During the Great War in Europe, especially in the first phase from 1792 to the Peace of Amiens a decade later, America as the chief of neutrals had built up a carrying trade of vast proportions. The million[1] or more tons of shipping engaged in this trade constituted an important interest for the nation, and one which in predominantly commercial districts like Massachusetts was paramount.

Among the mercantile community, accordingly, the action of our Government in replying to the Berlin and Milan Decrees and the Orders in Council of 1806 and 1807, which greatly hampered commerce, by an embargo which prohibited it wholly, was viewed with consternation. And in proportion as mercantile interests determined the opinion of the people, the embargo was execrated as the knell of American prosperity. As a result, something of a tradition has grown up in American history as to the hard times produced by that "ill judged" measure.

If the embargo offered small comfort to commerce, it gave a wholly new impetus to manufactures. And herein lies the explanation of a sudden prosperity enjoyed by certain commercial cities at the very time when their sisters and rivals were most depressed. It was not that their shipping was less hit, but rather that their opportunities for a transfer of capital to manufactures were greater. This seems to have been especially true of the commercial cities of Pennsylvania and Maryland, doubtless in part because of the great demand for manufactured articles throughout the rapidly developing trans-Alleghany region. Baltimore is an example of a commercial city suddenly widening its field of activities. The Baltimore newspapers during the year of the embargo have numerous advertisements of and other references to rapidly expanding manufactures. But Philadelphia is a more conspicuous example of a commercial city—she had something like a twelfth of the shipping tonnage of the United

[1] Boston Gazette Extra; Jan. 11, 1808, puts the American tonnage at 1,200,000. Cf. Richmond Enquirer, Dec. 17, 1808, which estimates American shipping tonnage at 800,000.

States—able by means of manufactures, in spite of the gloom among the purely mercantile elements, to develop a high degree of prosperity.

The present study will attempt to show that industrial gains so far offset commercial losses that the year of the embargo coincided, in Philadelphia at least, with a notable prosperity. It must be conceded, however, that the depression of the shipping interests was grave. So sudden a cessation of commerce spelled ruin to both capital and labor in so far as either was unable to adjust itself to an industrial basis. And one is not surprised that those upon whom the burden of readjustment was imposed felt it keenly. Even granting that new avenues to prosperity lay open for those whose former life was commerce, still the process of readjustment is seldom simple and would ruin some, while enriching others. There is, therefore, in the very nature of things a dark side to Philadelphia life in 1808. It is necessary to take that into account. The merchants and the seamen dependent upon them for a livelihood were the victims of a situation in which manufactures was the only outlet. To such of them as were unable to avail themselves of this outlet the times were, indeed, hard.

The merchants of Philadelphia had some warning of the embargo by the act of April 18, 1806, "to prohibit the importation of certain goods, wares, and merchandise." This act was originally passed as a threat, and stood for many months in abeyance. But fearing that now (December, 1807) the act was finally to be enforced, the Philadelphians petitioned Congress to let it remain a dead letter. Their pe ition was tabled, however, by a vote of 79 to 50.[2] But to men who opposed mere nonimportation, an embargo in addition was far from pleasing.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Philadelphians were among the first to seek a loophole for evading the new legislation. Undaunted by their former experience with Congress, they now came forward with a second petition, this time for a grant of clearance papers to those vessels already in cargo when the embargo act was published.[3] To grant this would have liberated from 300 to 400 vessels in the various ports of the country, in contravention of the entire purpose of the act, and Congress, after but slight debate, tabled this petition also by the decisive vote of 91 to 16.[4]

These two experiences with Congress practically ended direct action on the part of the merchants. They did, however, make one further protest, this time not against the embargo itself, but against an exception to it, permitted by the President in his executive capacity. A certain Chinese who claimed to be a great mandarin of Canton, by

[2] Annals of Congress xviii, 1179, 1187.

[3] Ibid., xviii, 1272.

[4] Ibid., 1275. Of the approximately 800,000 tons of American shipping in 1808, Pennsylvania, i. e., Philadelphia, possessed 86,723. Cf. Richmond Enquirer, Dec. 17, 1808.

imposing upon the credulity or the internationalism of the President, had obtained permission to proceed in a vessel to Canton, and there to load a return cargo. This was too much for plain American citizens who had no flowing robes and peacock feathers wherewith to unlock the gates of commerce, and a group of Philadelphia merchants wrote to Albert Gallatin, the Secretary of the Treasury, their opinion of the transaction. They assured the Secretary in the first place that men of mandarin rank never emigrated from the Celestial Empire, and in the second, that several of their own number had lived in Canton and personally knew this *soi-disant* mandarin to be a person of no consequence. "To some of us he is known only as a petty shopkeeper in Canton, utterly incapable of giving a credit; and to the remainder he is altogether unknown; which would not be the case were his character and standing in any degree respectable." They considered him an imposter and a tool in the hands of others, and allowed the Government to realize that it had been duped.[5]

But these formal communicatins from rich and conservative merchants were not the only anti-embargo protests which emanated from Philadelphia. Thomas Leiper, a friend and correspondent of Jefferson, described for the latter's benefit the hardships of poor flatboat men under regulations compelling a bond of $300 a ton for little sloops in the coas wise trade; $9,000, therefore, for a vessel of 30 tons, worth all told no more than $300. In the case in point the owner had only a half interest, and Leiper exclaims, "Nine Thousand Dollars, is this *reasonable*, is this *just* to require a man his bond to follow his lawfull business for Nine Thousand Dollars who is only worth One Hundred and Fifty—But he must give it too for his all is in the Flatt and he most (*sic*) keep soul of Body together abstracted from his being able to pay for his other half of his Flat."[6]

On no other class in the community did the embargo weigh more heavily than on the officers of merchant ships, men bred to the sea as a profession, who could not lightly turn to the first new work that offered. Their complaint is full of pathos. In terms the most respectful, they urge Jefferson to keep their situation near his heart, "that means may be had to prevent our Families beging, there (*sic*) subsistance." As for themselves they declare, "We become irksome to our friends; and no means by which we can subsist left us."[7]

The common sailors, too, were wretched enough, and one can not but commiserate them. In one sense, however, their situation was less serious than that of their officers, because they had less to surrender in leaving the sea, and might have been expected to adjust

[5]Jefferson MSS. (Library of Congress), to Albert Gallatin, Aug. 10, 1808.

[6]Ibid. Thomas Leiper to Jefferson. Philadelphia, Jan. 27, 1808.

[7]Jefferson MSS. Library of Congress. Philadelphia petition of Aug. 10, 1808. See also a similar petition of Aug. 8, 1808.

themselves to the lot of a laborer on the land with less difficulty. Be that as it may, their memorial to Jefferson relating their sad condition loses nothing in pathos from the English in which it is couched.

Philadelphia Dat November 14th 1808

We Distrsat Seamen of Philadelphia
Petitioners to you Honoure
Thomas Jeffarison President of the United States. We Humble Bag your Honur to Sum weekly allowance. Sir at as Hard times pon us seamen your Hounr Nos 50 or 60 Coasting vissels will not carry 4 or 5000 seamen. Out of this Port Sir we Humble bag your Honur to grant us destras seamen sum releif for God nos what we will do your Petitioners is at Present utterly destitute of all Employamat We Humble Bag Honur to grant us som employmant.
200 of us mat in the State Hous yard on friday Last we Have all wifes & famlys sir we Humble bags your Honur Pardon of at mis.

(signed) Thomas Truman.[8]

Shipowners, ship captains, common seamen, and longshoremen like the protégé of Leiper, of necessity bore the full burden of the embargo. Their situation was indeed a hard one, and confirms one in thinking that only great prosperity among other classes of citizens would justify an assumption of Philadelphia prosperity in 1808. But this is, of course, only one side of the case. And there is abundant evidence that other classes were actually in the enjoyment of the counterbalancing prosperity. That the city was at any rate far from presenting one unbroken front of misery is plain from the United States Gazette of October 8, 1808, which, though an opposition paper endeavoring to make out the worst possible case, reluctantly admits even a certain degree of prosperity. "The embargo," declares the Gazette, "has as yet produced *comparatively* little inconvenience in this city and its neighborhood. During the last winter, we began to suffer from the domiciliary visits of labourers, *in forma pauperis*, who could not find employment and were obliged to beg; but, generally, the stores laid in by poor men before the embargo were sufficent 'to keep want from their doors' until the spring opened; since when, the unexampled improvements in our city have given constant employment to eight or ten thousand of them."[9] To preserve the proper tone of opposition gloom, the Gazette predicts a hard winter as soon as frost suspends these building operations. Meanwhile, the fact would not down that Philadelphia was in the midst of a wholly unprecedented building boom.

One estimate places the number of houses erected at nearly 400; another at 1,000. The former gives details as to the stimulus thereby contributed to general industry, and declares that "In Philadelphia the embargo, although felt severely, has not produced distress ac-

[8]Ibid. Thomas Truman and others to Jefferson. Philadelphia Nov. 14, 1808.
[9]United States Gazette, Philadelphia, Oct. 8, 1808.

cording to the population. This is owing in a great measure to the buildings now erecting in the city. The capital of the merchants and monied men being withdrawn from commerce, has been appropriated to other purposes. Almost four hundred houses are now erecting in the city, which, allowing twenty men to each house including carpenters, brickmakers, bricklayers, masons, labourers, &c., now give employment to 8,000 of our citizens who would otherwise be severely affected by the embargo. Besides, the banks have continued their discounts, and have, indeed, so much money to lend, that no man who has tolerable personal security to offer will be refused a discount."[10]

A rather playful explanation of this era of construction, involving the building of possibly 1,000[11] new houses at Philadelphia alone in the single year of the embargo, attributes it to the prosperity of the Philadelphia lawyers. To these virtuous citizens the embargo brought a blessing in disguise. The very act which restrained commerce multiplied marine lawsuits, and their effect upon the gentry of the bar is humorously described by Horace Binney, one of its own distinguished ornaments.

> The stoppings, seizures, takings, sequestrations, condemnations, all of a novel kind unlike anything that had previously occurred in the history of maritime commerce—the consequence of new principles of national law, introduced offensively or defensively by the belligerent powers—gave an unparalleled harvest to the bar of Philadelphia. No persons are bound to speak better of Bonaparte than the bar of this city. He was, it is true, a great buccaneer, and the British followed his example with great spirit and fidelity, but what distinguished him and his imitators from the pirates of former days was the felicitous manner in which he first, and they afterwards, resolved every piracy into some principle of the law of nations, newly discovered or made necessary by new events; thus covering or attempting to cover the stolen property by the veil of the law. Had he stolen and called it a theft, not a single lawsuit could have grown out of it. The under-writers must have paid and have been ruined at once and outright. But he stole from neutrals and called it lawful prize; and this led to such a crop of questions as nobody but Bonaparte was capable of sowing the seeds of. For while he did everything that was abominable, he always had a reason for it, and kept the world of the law inquiring how one of his acts and his reasons for it bore upon the policy of insurance, until some new event occurred to make all that they had previously settled of little or no application. In many instances the insurance companies got off; in others, though they failed, it was after a protracted campaign in which, contrary to campaigns in general, they acquired strength to bear their defeat. In the mean time, both in victory and defeat, and very much the same in both events, the lawyers had their reward.[12]

It is hardly necessary to remark that although Philadelphia lawyers were reaping a harvest that has made their name a byword for

[10] "The Republican and Savannah Evening Ledger," Oct. 28, 1808, quoting Gazette of the United States and New York Public Advertiser.

[11] Annals of Congress, XIX, 100-103.

[12] Charles Chauncey Binney, Life of Horace Binney, pp. 60-61.

shrewdness and success, this could not represent a net gain to the community. The real expansion of Philadelphia lay in industrial enterprise, and progress in this direction appears to have more than compensated for losses commercial.

In the very nature of things the embargo proved a stimulus to manufactures. And nowhere was this stimulus more promptly felt than in Philadelphia. Manufactures were of course not unknown before 1808, but in that year they assumed an altogether fresh variety and significance. The Philadelphia Price Current devoted to them an article which produced a local sensation, and which the editor at once forwarded to Jefferson "to prove that by the Presidents originating partial deprivations, he has ultimately bestowed on his country immense and imperishable benefits."[13]

The inclosure, which must have given keenest satisfaction to the harassed Jefferson, is here quoted in full, notwithstanding its length, as proof conclusive of the manufacturing impetus of the period.

AMERICAN MANUFACTURES

The following new American Manufactures, we quote with pleasure, as an evidence of the increase of public spirit, and a sure pressage of future prosperity and independence.

Floor Cloth carpets of any size with or without border per sq. yard	$2. 25	Manufactured by John Dorsey.
The same with three colours	2. 00	
The same with two colours	1. 75	
The same with one colour	1. 50	
The patterns are in great variety and the colours bright, hard and durable.		
Cotton Bagging, per yd. 50 cts	Apply to Maclure & Robertsons.	
Printed Calicoes (war'd fast colours) pr yd.	20c	Manufactured by John Thoburn & Co.
4–4———25 a	27	
Shawls assorted 9–8 per shawl	21	
4–4 do.	32	
5–6 do. 50 a	58	
Bed spreads 10–4	$1.	

EARTHEN WARE.

Yellow—Tea Pots, Coffee Pots and Sugar Boxes per doz.	$3.	Manufactured by Binney & Ronaldson.
Assorted Ware do.	$1. 25	
Red-Tea Pots, Coffee Pots and Sugar Boxes per doz.	$2. 50	

GLASS WARE.

Green hlf gall. Bottles per doz	$2.	Manufactured by T. Harrison & Co.
Do. quart Do do	1	
Green hlf. gall. Jars do	2.	
Do. quarts Do do	1.	
White hlf. gall. Jars do	7. 50	
Do. quart Do do	3. 75	
Green Pocket Bottles do	80	
Glass per pound do	50	

[13] Jefferson MSS. Library of Congress. Editor of the Philadelphia Price Current to Jefferson, Nov. 7, 1808.

Windsor Soap per lb.	35	Manufactured by W. Lehman, W. Smith & son.
Fancy do. per dozen	$2 a 3.	
Sealing Wax per lb.	50 cts. $3	
White Lead per cwt.	$17 a 18	Manufactured by Dr. Joseph Strong.
Red Lead do	15	
Litharge do	15	
Shot B B B la 12 per cwt	$11.	This extensive manufactory (Paul Beck's) goes into operation this day.
Do. S G G and Buck	13	
Bar Lead	10.50	
Shot B B B la 10 per cwt	12.	Manufactured by Bishop & Sparks.
Do. Goose and Buck	10.50	
Bar Lead		
Floor Cloths per square yard	$1.75	Apply at Domestic Manufactory.
Do. do do	2 a 2.25	
Cotton Flannel per yard	47	
Acet. Distillat .....gall	$ 60	
Acid Muriatic .....lb		
Aq. Fortis dup	45	
Alcohol .....gall	2.	
Aq. Amon c Cale .....lb	20	
———— c Tart	22	
Calomel Crud.	1.90	
——Ppt	2.10	
Camphor Refin.....		
Ether Vitriol	1.75	
Liq. Anod. Min. Hoff.....	.75	
Lunar Caustic .....oz.	1.50	
Merc. Corros. Sublim	1.50	
Ol. Vitriol	.15	
Sp. Nitri Dulc	34	
—Vitrirol Dulc.....	75	
—Salis. Volat. Arom	75	
—Nitri Fortis		
—Vinos. Rect. G. P. Proof.....gall.	1.50	
—Turpentine	40	
Patent Green .....lb	67	
Vermilion .....lb	1.50	
Tartar Emetic .....lb	1	
Vitriol Roman	25	
Varnish Bright.....gall		

Manufactories of various other articles are in operation, and several rapidly progressing; we could not, however, for the present number ascertain with precision the just denomination of articles or their quotation, but shall soon increase our paper so as to embody them in the general prices of Domestic Articles, and for that purpose *invite communications.*[14]

It will have been noticed that white lead receives mention in this Price Current of November, 1808. Yet three months later, in February, 1809, William Dalzell of Philadelphia, apparently ignorant of the output of Doctor Strong, sent Jefferson "a sample of I believe the first White Lead ever manufactured in the U. States." He complimented the President on the wisdom of the embargo as the measure which was making possible the industrial growth on every hand, and concluded with a fervent hope that Congress would adopt the one means which could insure permanence to these infant industries, namely a protective tariff.[15]

[14] Hope's Philadelphia Price Current and Commercial Record in Jefferson MSS.
[15] Ibid. Wm. Dalzell to Jefferson, Philadelphia, Feb. 10, 1809.

Curiously enough, neither Dalzall nor the Price Current speaks of the heavier manufactures depending upon iron and steel. But an advertisement in Duane's paper, the Aurora, supplies the missing evidence.

AMERICAN MANUFACTURES

The acting committee of the society of Iron-mongers, of the city of Philadelphia, give notice, that agreeable to a resolution of the society, they will receive proposals for manufacturing any of the following articles, to wit:

Cast WAGGON BOXES, neatly ground inside.
Cast SAD IRONS, made agreeable to the Dale co. patterns, and neatly ground to the face and edges.
FRYING PANS with long handles.
PLAIN IRONS, Socket and Firmer CHIZELS and GOUGES, Carpenters' ADZES, FILES, RASPS, STEELYARDS and HOES.

The proposals must be in writing, stating the probable quantity that can be furnished within a stated period with their price, delivered in this city, and in all cases to be accompanied with samples. Application to be made to either of the subscribers.[16]

The wording of this advertisement is obscure, it must be granted, casting some doubts as to whether the articles were to be manufactured in Philadelphia or elsewhere. It is clear, however, that a society of ironmongers existed, and the presumption is strongly in favor of their being in active business.

From time to time, the Aurora contained other advertisements bearing witness to still greater diversity in Philadelphia manufactures. Thus machines for repairing weavers' reeds,[17] felting superior to the imported,[18] satinets, muslinets, cotton stripes, bed tickings,[19] Germantown stockings, socks, and gloves, fleecy hosiery, and cotton and woolen yarns,[20] all contributed to American self-sufficiency, and to the enrichment of their *entrepreneurs*.

It is thus apparent that Philadelphia prosperity in 1808 was not a mere shifting of wealth from merchants to their lawyers, but a genuine progress, resting on an active and diversified industrial basis. As Charles Jared Ingersoll summarized it,

Who that walks the streets of Philadelphia, and sees, notwithstanding a twelve months stagnation of trade, several hundred substantial and elegant houses building, and the labouring community employed at good wages, who reads at every corner advertisements for workmen for factories of glass, of shot, of arms, of hosiery and coarse cloths, of pottery and many other goods and wares; who finds that within the last year rents have risen one-third, and that houses are hardly to be had at these prices; that land is worth, as Mr. Brougham observes, much more than it is in Middlesex; in a word, who perceives, wherever he goes, the bustle of industry and the smile of content; who, under such circumstances, that is not too stupid to perceive,

[16] Aurora, Philadelphia Mar. 21, 1808.
[17] Ibid., Apr. 14, 1808.
[18] Ibid., June 3, 1808.
[19] Ibid., Oct. 18, 1808.
[20] Ibid., Nov. 2, 1808.

and too prejudiced to believe when he does perceive, can doubt the solid capital of this country?[21]

Nicholas Biddle also, though he has less to say about the embargo and its effects than one would expect from so important a man of affairs, confirms Ingersoll's estimate of Philadelphia prosperity. Writing to a friend in Paris, he says,

You would scarcely recognize Philadelphia, so much has it grown and improved. Among your former acquaintances, Cadwalader is always here and prospering. His wife has just presented him with a third child. Chauncey is making a fine fortune, and surely no one deserves it more than he. As for politics, our actual position is not the most agreeable. The embargo presses heavily on the people, but it has been put in execution without difficulty, and as the people is very sane, the session of Congress soon to meet will be peaceably awaited. In spite of this the embargo appears to have wrought some change in New England, where the elections have terminated in favor of the Federalists. There is even an appearance . . . that the Government of the United States will pass once more into the control of the Federalist Party, or at least that the embargo will be raised before very long. In all these matters I do not mingle. After my long absence, it is impossible to become a very zealous partisan, and I am occupying myself with my profession.[22]

Interesting testimony this is as to the possibility of living in 1808 without worrying over the embargo, its wisdom, or its consequences, although no Philadelphian could quite ignore the prosperity his own city was harvesting.

If confirmation of these estimates of Ingersoll and Biddle is needed, it is to be found in a communication of William Short, a friend of Jefferson, to the President. Short possessed a handsome fortune and, like Biddle, would have seen little to recommend in the embargo had it proved as ruinous as its enemies alleged. He writes,

And this City (Philadelphia) has really acted as the government could wish on the subject of the embargo—I speak of those who are considered as of opposition politics & who are numerous—They frequently & publicly speak their determination to support it, & if on a jury to punish with rigor the violators of it. I have more than once heard it affirmed & not contradicted, that if the merchants of this City were assembled; confined to Federalists alone, nine out of ten would approve the embargo, & of the Tenth disapproving, most of them would be men without capital.[23]

But the best test of the economic situation, better than the enthusiasm of Ingersoll and Short or the contentment of Biddle, was the state of political parties in 1808. Economics and politics are so interrelated that if commercial stagnation had proved ruinous to any considerable proportion of the citizens, popular discontent would have registered itself in the overthrow of the Republican machine. Nothing of the sort occurred. The State legislature passed a resolution

[21] Charles Jared Ingersoll, "A View of the Rights and Wrongs, Power and Policy of the United States of America." (1808), p. 49.

[22] Nicholas Biddle Papers. Library of Congress. I. 1775–1809. Nicholas Biddle to Mr. J. M. de la Grange. Sept. 26, 1808.

[23] Jefferson MSS. Library of Congress. William Short to Jefferson, Aug. 27, 1808

most reassuring to the Federal authorities.[24] And although the campaign for the governorship in 1808 was warmly fought, the Federalists thinking that they had even made inroads upon the Irish vote[25] which already by tradition belonged to the Democrats, nevertheless the final victory for Snyder and the party of Jefferson was decisive, the Republican majority being "immense," to use the language of an enthusiastic contemporary.[26] As one of the President's correspondents in Philadelphia stated it,

> A stranger from reading our antirepublican newspapers, might have anticipated a different issue, but we are sound to the core. We believe the General Government has, by its measures, consulted our true interests, and we wished in the day of election to express that sentiment in the strongest possible terms.[27]

In Congress the Pennsylvania delegation was not wholly united. One of its members, William Hoge, was irreconcilable, being the only man in Congress to vote with Barent Gardenier of New York for a frank submission to the edicts of Great Britain and France.[28] But his colleague, Smilie, who led the proadministration forces of the State, made in the early debates a strong speech on behalf of the embargo,[29] and consistently maintained his position.[30] The Pennsylvania record varies only slightly between the 11 to 5 with 2 not voting, for the original embargo act of December 18, 1807,[31] and the 10 to 6 with 2 not voting, for the nonintercourse act which superseded it on February 27, 1809.[32]

Whatever the temptation to oppose the embargo, Congressmen, at least from Philadelphia, were not allowed to forget the favor it enjoyed among the people back home. As some staunch defenders of the administration expressed it,

> We behold in a temporary suspension of our commerce an ephemeral & doubtful evil, producing a great, a growing & a lasting good. We see arising out of this cause the prolific sources of our internal wealth explored & with industry & ability directed thro' channels, which while they benefit the enterprising, enrich our country with solid wealth & make her more independent & happy.[33]

And when, in January, 1809, the friends of embargo were called for a last rally in its defense for the passage of amendments which would make its operation ironclad, Philadelphians, at least the numerous element among them whom a share in the industrial

---

[24] Am. State Papers. For. Rel. III, 294, 295.
[25] United States Gazette, Oct. 8, 1808.
[26] The Palladium, Frankfort, Ky. Nov. 3, 1808.
[27] Jefferson MSS, Library of Congress Elijah Griffith to Jefferson, Philadelphia Nov. 14, 1808.
[28] Annals of Congress. XIX, 853.
[29] Ibid., XVIII, 1710.
[30] Ibid., XIX, 574.
[31] Journal of the House of Representatives. VI, 320-321.
[32] Ibid., VI, 565-566.
[33] Jefferson MSS. Library of Congress. Delegates of the Democratic Republicans of the city of Philadelphia to Jefferson. Mar. 1, 1808.

prosperity served to strengthen in their fidelity to party, lent their fullest measure of support. A broadside of the times rings like a bugle call.

ANOTHER
TOWN MEETING
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLICANS,
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA,

Your duty to your country—your political principles—your attachment to the present Administration—your sacred regard for the Union—and the fair fame of the city and county of Philadelphia, all imperiously call you to the State House on Tuesday next at 11 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Friends of the Constitution, Union and Commerce, are invited to a Town Meeting. Come forth in all your strength. Be ye firm, vigilant, and active. Your enemies are up and doing. January 29, 1809.[34]

In Philadelphia, as we have seen, the ruin of powerful commercial interests brought a real and somewhat widespread distress. But in Philadelphia, much more than in many other localities subject to similar commercial losses, men found compensation, and frequently much more than compensation, in the development of a large-scale industrialism. On this basis was reared the superstructure of building operations which made Philadelphia the wonder of the times, and at least one commercial city toward which Jefferson could point for vindication of his system. A prosperity in which so many types of citizens participated clinched the loyalty of city and State to the political party which sponsored it, and served to hold in the Democratic household of faith a State whose defection would have been peculiarly embarrassing at a time when Federalism was regaining so much lost ground in New England.

But this is drawing larger deductions than the thesis of the present paper undertook to establish. Its more modest task was to demonstrate that in the case of one great commercial city an embargo which should in theory have proved wholly ruinous, served in fact, partly in combination with growing demands from the western market, to stimulate manufactures to a point where prosperity exceeded adversity. It may be that the paper has incidentally demonstrated that the tradition that the hard times in 1808 were attributable solely to the embargo, the weak device of an impractical philosopher, a tradition largely fostered by New England, should not be accepted without a certain degree of caution. For Philadelphia, at least, such an assumption concerning the embargo is untenable.

[34] Broadside in the Library of Congress. Vol. 93. Pennsylvania.

XIV. AGRARIAN DISCONTENT IN THE SOUTH: 1880-1900

By BENJAMIN B. KENDRICK
Columbia University

AGRARIAN DISCONTENT IN THE SOUTH: 1880–1900[1]

By Benjamin B. Kendrick

The causes of agrarian discontent in the South from 1880 to 1900 were both social and economic. Time permits of the discussion of only two phases of these causes. First, the low social status of the southern farmer in 1890, relative to his high status in 1860; second the lien law system which was a grievance peculiar to the southern farmer of this period and not shared by his brother in the West.

In order to understand the first cause, it is necessary to remind ourselves of the fact that previous to the Civil War the agricultural class in the South was by far the most articulate in that section and even to a certain extent in the United States. Their manners and customs fixed the standard of polite society. They dominated the politics of their counties and States, and until the election of Abraham Lincoln in 1860 they were not without a major share of influence in the National Government. Even in the cities their influence was potent, for what commercial and industrial interests there were did not challenge the dominance of the planters. The merchants depended for their prosperity upon the patronage of the farmers and were distinctly secondary in importance to them. There were not enough manufacturers in the South before 1860 to feel a distinct class interest. Professional men such as lawyers, physicians, clergymen, editors, and teachers were largely drawn from the agricultural classes. Hence their views were reflected in the courtrooms and legislative halls, in the pulpits, in the columns of the newspapers and magazines, in the academies and colleges. At no other period in American history were the ideas and ideals of one class so completely unchallenged as were those of the southern planters during the last three decades of the ante-bellum South.

Certainly not all farmers were large slaveholders, but the small farmer shared in the benefits that accrued to agriculture as a whole because of the dominance of the planters in the county seats, the State capitals, and even in Washington. No greater mistake can be made than to suppose that there was any great social demarcation among southern planters derived from the numbers of acres owned or slaves held. I am referring only to those farmers who depended

[1] W. S. Morgan, History of the Wheel and Alliance, 1891; C. H. Otken, The Ills of the South, 1894; E. A. Allen, Labor and Capital.

upon cotton as their means of livelihood. The cotton industry was too young to have developed an aristocracy. It must be remembered that there had been only two generations of cotton growers when the Civil War began, and in many sections there had been but one. Even in the counties of western Georgia, where the Creek Indians had lived until the late twenties, and in which section I have made considerable personal investigation, I have found that nearly all the farmers there in 1860 had come with very little wealth in money or slaves. The same thing was true of the newer cotton regions of Alabama, Mississippi, northern Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas. Even in the older cotton regions of eastern Georgia, western South Carolina, North Carolina, and Tennessee, not more than two generations of cotton growers had lived before 1860. It is idle to suppose that in these regions there were any great marked social differences. Land was cheap and even small farmers owned several hundred acres; so when we say that social and political life in the South was dominated by the agriculturists, we mean all the cotton farmers. We are not considering here the great rice, sugar, and tobacco growers of South Carolina, Louisiana, and Virginia. Here there was, indeed, something of an aristocracy. Nor are we thinking of the so-called poor whites of the great pine barrens or their economic kinsmen of the mountainous country. Among these people hardly any class consciousness existed.

Twenty years after he War between the States closed, the same people or their sons were living in the cotton regions of the South. Some of them owned less land than in 1860, some more. The average size of farms had declined somewhat, because there were more farmers. The estate of a father may have been divided among his sons. There were a few newcomers from the North or from the poorer white classes of the mountains or the pine barrens. A few negroes owned part of the land of their old masters; but essentially the same people or their sons were raising cotton in 1890 as in 1860, and on the same land. But how changed their condition! They were no longer the social leaders. The State governments had generally passed from their hands. They controlled the counties in only those sections where there were no urban communities worthy the name city. Their influence at Washington under a Democratic administration was next to nothing and under a Republican administration was quite nothing at all. Preachers no longer ransacked the Scriptures to find that God wholly approved the interests of agriculture, but preached the gospel according to Henry Ward Beecher and Samuel Smiles. Lawyers found fatter fees serving the interests of railroads, merchants, urban real estate dealers, lumber kings, mining princes and the new manufacturing classes whose enterprise was creating that "New South" hailed first by Henry W. Grady and after-

wards by thousands of orators from high-school rostrums to legislative halls.

The prosperity of the South still depended to a large extent upon the size of the cotton crop and the price of the staple, but the growers were no longer the dominant class. Social prestige no longer depended upon ownership of land, but upon the ownership of a merchandising house, city real estate, stock in a manufacturing enterprise or bank, or even upon a managerial or technological position in one of these establishments. To all of these the farmer was socially inferior, no matter if his father had lorded it over half a hundred slaves and owned 2,000 acres of land. Even the $20-a-month clerks in the stores regarded themselves as better than the farmers. The very mechanics or factory operatives, descendants for the most part of the despised poor whites, yielded nothing of social prestige to the farmers. At least they lived in the city and had advantages which the farmers did not have.

This change in social status had been caused by an economic revolution that had taken place in less than 30 years. What were its causes? In the first place, to the farmer, the Civil War and Reconstruction had brought desolation and ruin. In the cities a war followed by reconstruction had accelerated if not caused an industrial revolution similar in character to that which had taken place in England nearly a century before, and in the East 50 years before. The farmer had taken up the burden of making a living in 1865 under most trying circumstances. His stock was killed or stolen, his fences and barns and frequently his dwelling were destroyed or in poor repair, his land had deteriorated from poor management, his slaves were freed, thus tending to confuse freedom from slavery with freedom from any sort of labor. Then came from 5 to 10 years of reconstruction during which the negroes became even more demoralized and disinclined to work for wages. The effort to continue to utilize the negro as the basis of farm labor first gave rise to the so-called black codes, which had for their main purpose the forcing of negroes to take positions as agricultural laborers on the lands of their old masters. It is true that these codes contemplated a sort of peonage for the negro and from that standpoint were indefensible in the North which, so its leading politicians declared, had just fought a four years' war for the purpose of ridding the country of every sort of slavery and serfdom. Hence these codes became null and void through the passage of the Civil Rights Act and the Fourteenth Amendment. From the southern farmer's point of view, these laws were necessary if the land was to continue to support the negroes and themselves, for it was a pretty generally accepted conclusion, tested by a year or more of experience, that the negro was disinclined to render steady service on a freedom of contract wage basis. Even the more conscientious agent

of the Freedmen's Bureau admitted that a contract in the eyes of the negroes was not a very sacred document.

Then came the effort to obtain work from the negro by placing at his disposal land ordinarily sufficient to constitute a one-mule farm. This was to be operated on the share basis, usually half and half, the landlord furnishing the house for the tenant as well as his stock and farming implements. Fertilizers and seed were paid for jointly, and the tenant was to pay out of his half at the end of the year whatever the landlord had advanced for his maintenance. Under this so-called "cropping system" the negro was much happier than under the wage system. For the first time in his life he enjoyed the blessing of self-determination as to the disposal of his own time and efforts. He could work when, if, and as he pleased. The landlord was free to give him advice which was usually humbly received with expressions of gratitude and respect and quickly forgotten or quietly ignored.

As long as the southern local and State governments were in the hands of the carpetbaggers, the landlord had little or no redress. But white dominion returned. One of the first acts passed by the redeemed legislatures were lien laws, ostensibly in the interests of the landlords, but, as the event proved, greatly to their detriment. The object of the laws was to give the landlord a mortgage upon the products, both actual and potential, of the tenant, until the end of the year when the settlement was to be made. This would have benefited the farmer if he had had the capital himself with which the tenant produced the crop. But such capital only a very few farmers indeed possessed. They owned land which during the 30 years following the Civil War was very low in value, so low in fact that it frequently happened that they could not obtain any money on it at all even if it were owned free and clear.

We have alreay mentioned the fact that the close of the war left the farmer devoid of all sorts of capital except his land. Hence it became necessary for him to obtain credit from the town merchant, who in turn borrowed from the local banker, who in his turn was under obligations to the central banks, especially New York banks. As a rule the merchant was unwilling to take a mortgage upon the farmer's land, and the farmer seldom could borrow directly from the banker on his land as a security. Neither the banker nor the merchant could afford to tie up capital in securities that had such problematic value and upon which ready cash could hardly ever be obtained. Of all classes in business of any sort, the farmer could obtain credit only on the hardest terms and with the greatest difficulty. Even in case the farmer was able to borrow directly on his land, the terms were so hard and the amount raised so little that it usually was not long before he had consumed all that he had borrowed and was back again applying to the merchant for credit. During

the reconstruction period the merchants had lost considerable money by furnishing farmers and their negro tenants on no other security than personal notes. The declining prices and the undependableness of labor had made it very hard for the farmers to come out even after each year's crop; hence it often happened that they were unable to meet their obligations to the merchant, who was thus put to the expense and trouble of a lawsuit. Consequently, when the lien laws were passed the merchant was quick to take advantage of them, and in a very few years it was the customary thing for a merchant to demand of every farmer who asked credit the execution of one of these "ironclad" or "anaconda" mortgages. In return for supplies for himself and tenants the farmer gave the merchant a mortgage on his crop, on his stock, and on his agricultural implements, wagons, buggies, etc.

It was generally provided in the mortgage that the accounts on the merchant's books would be incontestable as to the amounts which the farmer owed the merchant at the end of the year. It frequently happened that the farmer's and his tenants' crops were not sufficient to pay these amounts at the end of the year; consequently the farmer was obliged to continue from year to year in debt to the same merchant under the same galling conditions. For the supplies which the farmer purchased on credit during the spring and summer, the merchant generally charged from 25 to 50 per cent above the local cash prices. The merchant demanded that the farmer and his tenants plant most of their land in cotton. His object in doing this was twofold. In the first place, he would be sure to obtain a commodity which he could turn into money, and in the second place it meant that if the farmer did not raise his own meat and corn he would have to buy these products from the merchant and so increase the latter's sales at very handsome profits. Thus it happened that the farmer's capital, even with the addition of his personal labor, proved hardly sufficient to support himself and family in any sort of comfort. In thousands of cases, during the period of low prices for cotton in the early nineties, it proved altogether insufficient, and the land began to go piecemeal to the merchant. Cotton which during the seventies and eighties had averaged about 11 and 9 cents, respectively, averaged about 6½ cents in the nineties, reaching the low level of 4.6 cents in 1894. A good portion of the land consequently passed into the hands of merchants, who cropped it on their own account with negro or poor white tenants. As a rule negroes preferred to crop the land of merchants, as this removed them still further from any sort of supervision. As a consequence, the merchants were able to obtain for their own land the choice of the negroes, and the farmer saw his better tenants tolled off to the merchant lands and himself left with tenants of second-rate character and intelligence.

Of course, all farmers did not work their land by means of the cropping system. Some hired negroes for what was called standing wages, and many did all or a considerable part of the work themselves. The farmer who did most or all of his work on a relatively small portion of land was usually better off than his neighbor who owned more land, but put it to cultivation in the hands of croppers. That is to say, he was more likely to come out even at the end of the year, and if he was thrifty and a fairly good manager, he might even get ahead sufficiently to run his place on a pay-as-you-go basis. Hence we often hear of men being land poor. But the small farmer suffered from the low prices of the nineties and had in common with the other farmers the grievance against the State taxation system, the poor educational system, the railroads, and, most important of all, the national system of currency and taxation.

Time does not permit me to go into detail concerning the grievances the farmers of the South had in these matters, but it will suffice to say that they were not unlike the same grievances that the farmers of the West had with regard to the same subjects. Prof. Solon Buck and other writers and investigators have stated very well what these grievances were and how the farmers attempted to remove them. The particular grievance of the southern farmer was the lien-law system, which kept him, as he often expressed it himself, the lien-law slave of the merchant.

It has not been my purpose here to state how southern farmers came to organize such societies as the Wheel and Industrial Union and the Farmers' Alliance and finally to agitate for the capture of the Democratic Party to make it serve agrarian purposes or, failing that, to organize a new party, the Populist, to accomplish the same purpose. This sort of thing might serve very well for young southern historical students who are looking for subjects for master's essays or doctoral dissertations. One of my own students has in preparation a doctor's dissertation on the Populist Party in Georgia, and I see no reason why such dissertations might not be prepared on the general social, political, and economic conditions in the other Southern States, covering the period from the point where the monographs on Reconstruction leave off to the close of the nineteenth century. It is my opinion that this period would prove very fertile in material for monographs that would help us to a just appreciation of the unfavorable conditions under which the southern farmer labored, and I am confident that such investigations would shatter the current erroneous notion that the southern farmers continued to dictate the policy of the State governments or the notion that it was their interest which the southern wing of the Democratic Party represented in the eighties and nineties, or for that matter represents at the present time.

XV. THE DEVELOPMENT OF ELECTROMAGNETISM DURING THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS

By A. E. KENNELLY

Harvard University and Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ELECTROMAGNETISM DURING THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS

By A. E. Kennelly

It is just 100 years ago since electricity and magnetism were discovered to be intimately connected. Prior to the year 1820, electricity and magnetism were regarded as distinctly separated sciences. Electricity was produced by friction and also electrochemically by the voltaic cell. Magnetism resided in permanent magnets and was communicated from one steel bar to another by appropriate contact.

In 1820 Hans Christian Oersted was professor of physics at Copenhagen.[1] He had in his laboratory a battery of voltaic cells and a magnetic needle. He knew that a wire carrying the current in a voltaic circuit becomes heated. The idea occurred to him that a metallic wire, heated in this way, might disturb a poised magnetic compass needle. He seems to have had no previous anticipation of the existence of a magnetic field around such a wire. He tried the experiment and found immediately a very marked and definite influence exerted by the wire upon the needle. This was not a thermal, but a magnetic, effect. The needle deflected strongly. In a few minutes of laboratory investigation, the two sciences of electricity and magnetism that had been separate and absolutely distinct in human thought since the night of time, were connected and became interrelated. Electromagnetism was born.

The news of this remarkable discovery spread rapidly among scientists. But this was before the electric telegraph era. Only the semaphore, working visually from hill to hill, transmitted messages along certain main European routes. Oersted's public announcement from Copenhagen bears the date of July 21, 1820, and was in Latin. This seems to have been the last announcement for the physical sciences transmitted in Latin through Europe, although Latin announcements in the botanical sciences have continued down to the present day. The news of the discovery was brought from Geneva to Paris by the French physicist, Arago, who repeated the experiment before the French Academy on September 11, 1820. Among those present was Prof. André Ampère of the École Polytechnique.

[1] Oersted, "Experimenta circa effectum conflictus electrici in acum magneticam." Hafn. July 21, 1820.

The demonstration stirred Ampère profoundly. He immediately set up a voltaic battery and some magnetic needles to repeat the experiment. Test followed test successfully and Ampère could scarcely find time for rest. The French Academy was scheduled to meet in Paris on September 18. Within the intervening week, Ampère prepared an epoch-making academy paper, greatly extending the scope of Oersted's discovery.

With the precision and clarity that have made French science famous for centuries, Ampère connected electricity[2] and magnetism so definitely in experiment, in mathematics, and in logic, that ever since the two sciences have been inseparably associated.

The next great step in the knowledge of electromagnetism was furnished by Faraday's first discovery, in 1831, of electromagnetic induction.[3] His researches continued for nearly 25 years, and indicated that electric forces are set up whenever relative motion occurs between a magnetic field and surrounding space. In particular, if relative motion occurs between a magnetic field and a conductor, an electric force is set up in the conductor, which may be utilized for producing an electric current. This discovery lies at the basis of all modern dynamo-electric machinery. Faraday actually constructed the first little dynamo-electric machine with his own hands.

Whereas the Oersted-Ampère researches demonstrated a relation between magnetism and electric flow, involving mechanical forces, Faraday's researches showed that any disturbance of a magnetic field, in time or in space, gave rise to electric phenomena. Researches made since Faraday's time have shown that, reciprocally, any disturbance of an electric field, in time or in space, gives rise to magnetic phenomena. In that sense, both electric and magnetic phenomena have come to be regarded as collateral aspects of any electromagnetic disturbance.

Prior to the year 1840, it may be said that there was no recognized science of energy, or capability of doing work. Energy was perhaps recognized as existing in various forms, such as heat energy, electric energy, magnetic energy, chemical energy and mechanical energy, including both potential and kinetic types; but there was no doctrine of equivalence between these forms. Owing to the work of many scientists during the decade 1840–1850, and particularly of Joule,[4]

---

[2] Ampère, "Sur l'état magnetique des corps qui transmettent un courant d'électricité". *Ann. Chem Phys.*, Vol. xvi, Paris, 1821.

[3] Faraday, "Experimental Researches in Electricity," Series I. London, 1831.

[4] Joule, James Prescott. Mem. Manchester. Soc. Ser. II, VII 1846, VIII 1848, IX 1851, X 1852. Phil. Tr. 1850, 1852, 1853, 1856. Sturgeon's Annals II 1838, III 1838–39, IV 1839–40, V 1840, VI 1841, VIII 1842. Phil. Mag. Ser. III, XIX 1841, XXII 1843, XXIII 1843, XXIV 1844, XXV 1844, XXVI 1845, XXVII 1845, XXVIII 1846, XXX 1847, XXXI 1847; Series IV, II 1851, III 1852, IV 1852, VI 1853, XII 1856, XIV 1857, XV 1858.

Helmholtz,[5] Colding,[6] Mayer and Kelvin,[7] it came to be recognized that if energy is apparently created at any time and place, it is merely transformed from some preexisting stock. According to this doctrine, which is now generally admitted, energy may be converted from one form to another, upon a definite basis of equivalence, but can neither be created nor destroyed. As a consequence of this doctrine, it would follow that the sum total of all the energy existing in the known universe remains constant. This is the famous doctrine of the conservation of energy. It is regarded to-day as so axiomatic that it is hard to realize how recently the doctrine has been promulgated and accepted.

A somewhat similar doctrine of the conservation of matter was not long since in very general acceptance. It was supposed that the total numbers of atoms of the different elementary substances remained constant, despite changes in their chemical combinations. This doctrine of the conservation of matter, however, has had to be surrendered, or at least considerably modified, as the result of researches on radium during the last few years. It is believed that atoms of radium, and other radioactive elements, occasionally break up spontaneously, as though by internal explosion, into atoms of other and simpler elements. Energy in relatively very large quantities is released by these atomic explosions.

Except for electroplating, the first application of electromagnetics was to telegraphy. The electric telegraph has a long history and a considerable literature prior to 1837; but its industrial introduction dates from about 1838 in England, on the Great Western Railway, using six wires. Very little was known about it publicly until 1845, when the arrest of an escaping murderer was accomplished with the aid of a telegram, thus drawing public attention to the utility of the telegraph. The first telegraph construction company—The Electric Telegraph Co.—was formed in that year.

In America, Joseph Henry published in 1831[8] the results of a series of researches he had made while in the then frontier town of Albany, N. Y., on the design and construction of electromagnets. In 1835 he developed and demonstrated the electromagnetic relay principle, whereby a feeble electric current, received from a distance, may

[5] Helmholtz, Hermann Ludwig Ferdinand: Über d'Erhaltung d'Kraft. Berol, 1847. Überd. Wechselswirkung d.Natur-Krafte und die darauf bezüglichen Ermittlungen d'Physik. Königsberg, 1854. Über d.Dauer u. d. Verlauf der durch Stromesschwankungen inducirten elekr. Strome. Pogg. Ann. 83, 1851.

[6] Colding, Ludwig Augustus. An examination of steam engines and the power of steam. Copenhagen, 1851. Undersögelse over Vanddampene og deres bevaegende Kraft i Dampmaskinen. Danske Vid. Selsk. Skriften, 1852. Undersögelser om de almindelige Naturkräfter og deres gjensidige afhängighed og i särdeleshed om den ved visse faste Legermes Gniding utviklide Varme. Ibid., 1854. Om Magnetens Indvirkning paa det blöde Jern.

[7] Lord Kelvin (Sir William Thomson) "Reprints of papers on electrostatics and magnetism." London, 1872.

[8] Silliman's Journal, 1831, No. 19, p. 400.

cause a delicate receiving electromagnet to actuate a light contact, and thus close the local circuit of a more powerful electromagnet.

Morse demonstrated his electromagnetic telegraph, working over half a mile[9] in 1837, and sought in vain, until the closing hours of the congressional session in 1843[10], for congressional appropriation to build a telegraph line. The first single-wire Morse line was completed from Baltimore to Washington on June 4, 1844.[11] The first published use of the electric telegraph to the determination of longitude, appears to have been between the Capitol at Washington and Battle Monument Square, Baltimore,[12] June 12, 1844.

The first submarine telegraph cable to be put into public use, was laid between Dover and Calais, across the English Channel, in 1851, following a partially successful attempt between Dover and Cape Gris-Nez, in 1850. The first transatlantic cable between Ireland and Newfoundland was laid in 1858, but failed electrically a few weeks after completion, and after having transmitted over 700 messages.[13] The first permanently successful cable between Ireland and Newfoundland was laid in 1866. At the present time there are no less than 15 such cables laid across the Atlantic Ocean.

Returning to the scientific side of the subject, Prof. James Clerk Maxwell showed, in 1867, that the known properties of electricity and magnetism led to the conclusion that electromagnetic disturbances were propagated through nonconductors, in waves, at definite speed.

These electromagnetic waves were also susceptible of being reflected and refracted like waves of light. He put forward the theory[14] that light was merely an electromagnetic disturbance, of such wave lengths as the eye could detect. This celebrated electromagnetic theory of light has since received confirmation and is now generally accepted. According to this doctrine, not only visible light, but all radiation of the thermal type, is electromagnetic. This in turn involves the theory that all luminous and thermally radiating sources are electromagaetically active, and therefore that all bodies are composed of atoms, which, at all working temperatures, are electromagnetically active. In that sense, all the rays of light and heat we receive from the sun are received as electromagnetic waves, across the intervening 150,000,000 kilometers and are steady wireless "messages" from the solar atoms. The electromagnetic theory of light was amply supported by the researches of Hertz, who, in 1888, showed experimentally that the electromagnetic waves emitted

---

[9] "Life of S. F. B. Morse." S. I. Prime, N. Y., 1875, Chapter XI pp. 473-509.

[10] *Congressional Globe*, Feb. 21, 1843

[11] "Life of S. F. B. Morse," p. 509.

[12] Ibid.

[13] "Life Story of Sir C. T. Bright." Charles Bright., Rev. 1908.

[14] James Clerk Maxwell, "Method of making a direct comparison of electrostatic with electrodyn, force and the electromagnetic theory of light," London, Phil. Trans. 158, 1869.

by a spark-discharging circuit possessed all the optical properties presaged by Maxwell's theory. It is now generally accepted that the invisible electromagnetic waves emitted from a radio telegraph antenna, or "wireless mast," differ from polarized light waves only as to their length. Radio waves vary from, say 50 meters to 20 kilometers in length. Visible light waves vary in length, approximately from 0.4 to 0.8 micron (millionth meter). The shortest radio wave would contain about 60,000,000 of the longest visible light waves. The long radio waves, however, can, fortunately, bend around the spherical earth's surface and follow its contour; whereas the short optical waves, except under extreme limiting conditions, move forward in straight or very nearly straight lines.

Modern electrochemical researches have led to the view that chemical affinity and chemical forces of molecular union are electromagnetic. This doctrine seems to be rapidly gaining support. It leads to the conclusion that, in a certain sense, chemistry is a branch of electromagnetics, and that chemical combinations can be explained electromagnetically. The explanations, however, are as yet only in an elementary stage.

Moreover, modern electric researches have led to the very generally accepted belief that all the atoms of elementary chemical substances are composed of electric charges called electrons. Just as a molecule of matter is supposed to be built up of atoms, so atoms are supposed to be built up of electrons. It has been estimated that the radius of an atom, assumed as spherical, is about 10^{-10} meter, or, as it has been expressed—if a drop of water were magnified to the size of the earth, the atoms in it might be expected to be about baseball size. But the "radius" of an electron is supposed to be about 10^{-15} meter, or one hundred-thousandth of the atomic radius, so that the atoms magnified into baseballs, might then have their component electrons sufficiently large to be detected by a good microscope.

Moreover, the electrons are commonly supposed to be in planetary or orbital motion around their atomic nuclei, so that, during the last half century, an atom has come to be regarded as a microcosm or planetary system, something like the solar system on an enormously reduced scale. There is at least as much evidence for the existence of the electron to-day, as an individual electromagnetic entity, as there was 50 years ago for the atom as an individual chemical entity. Moreover, the evidence is strong that the electrons in the different chemical atoms are all similar; so that, for example, an atom of hydrogen differs only from an atom of oxygen in the number, grouping, and orbital relations of its component electrons. In other words, the electron theory of the last two decades, as now very generally accepted, claims that electrons are the bricks of the materal world, out of which some 90 different kinds of chemical atoms are built, and that these

bricks are electric. Chemical atoms are therefore built up of organized electric charges, and chemistry is the science which teaches their electromagnetic relations, as revealed in combination.

This widespread modern electron theory has appropriated the whole material universe as its own. It claims that all matter is an aggregation of molecules, themselves made up of atoms, which in their turn are microcosms of organized electromagnetic entities; so that in this sense, everything is electricity. The properties of matter, like mass and inertia, thus become electromagnetic properties, and are explainable by the laws of electromagnetism as worked out in the laboratory. As to the fundamental nature of electricity and of magnetism, we have as yet only speculation; but the two are known to be definitely interconnected and related in such a manner that, if either of them could be explained, the nature of the other would thereby become determined.

The development of electromagnetic theoretical science during the last century has therefore led to its absorbing nearly all the other branches of natural philosophy. In the case of gravitation, however, although attempts have been made to find an explanation, by the electron theory, it has not yet been considered as accounted for. Very recently, the Einstein theory of relativity, which has received much scientific attention, seeks to explain gravitational force as a pseudo phenomenon, due to the departure of space from ordinary Euclidian three-dimensional geometry in the neighborhood of matter. It may be one of the tasks of scientific history of the next century to trace the influence of this theory on thought and accomplishment. At present it would seem that the results of the theory have no significance in ordinary business, insignificance in engineering or geodesy, a small but appreciable significance in astronomy, but an enormous significance in philosophy. For instance, all space is claimed to be finite in Einstein theory; but is infinite, or at least has no limits, in Euclidian theory. The Einstein theory, however, claims to be in accordance with, and to be based upon, the geometrical postulates of electromagnetics; so that, in this sense, it is an electromagnetic theory.

Turning once more to electromagnetic applications introduced during the last century, a complete list of them would be very lengthy. The following are important applications: electric lighting, heating, transportation, power transmission and distribution, electrochemical industry and electric furnaces, also electric communication by wire and radio, both telegraphically and telephonically. In wire telegraphy, the total length of working submarine cables on the globe (262,000 nauts) would go around its Equator nearly 12 times; while the total length of telegraph lines (2,520,000 km.) would go round it

nearly 63 times. In radio, or wireless telegraphy, signals are now receivable from powerful sending stations all around the world, under favorable conditions. The time required for the passage of any single radio wave to go half-way round the globe to the Antipodes has never yet been measured, but is estimated to be about one-tenth of a second; so that we are all living, according to that belief, on a tenth-of-a-second world of utmost separation in time. The human voice in speech, directed to a telephone transmitter at Arlington radio station near Washington, D. C., has been heard faintly and understood, at a receiver under the shadow of the Eiffel Tower in Paris, and also at a radio station in Hawaii.

Electromagnetism, during its history of the last hundred years, has, as a theoretical science, laid claim to absorb and include the sciences of physics, chemistry, and of the material universe. As an applied science it has been harnessed to many duties. It has destroyed distance and time as an agency of world communication.

Looking backward through the century that has passed, the science of electromagnetism has slowly but steadily advanced, without interruptions, discontinuities or reversals. The internationally accepted experimental facts bearing on the subject make up collectively the sum of human knowledge and experience in this domain. As time has gone on, this sum total has always increased. The interpretations of these facts, or the hypotheses built upon them, have undergone modification from time to time, as new facts have been added, so that electromagnetic theory is thus always, to a certain extent, in a state of flux, whereas electromagnetic knowledge is, in general, only modified by time in the sense of accretion. A very striking example of this contrast is offered by the recent Einstein doctrine of relativity. If future measurements should confirm this theory and lead to its general acceptance, electromagnetic knowledge would be scarcely affected; but our interpretation of this knowledge would be almost revolutionized. Our intellectual relations with the universe, so far as we can know it, would be profoundly modified.

The history also indicates that the study of electromagnetism is materialistic or imaginative or spiritual, according to the viewpoint and philosophy of the student contemplating the admitted facts. If the student has been materialistic, so also has been the electromagnetism he interpreted. If the student has been of an imaginative soul, so also has been the electromagnetic theory which the same facts depicted to his mind. From any aspect, however, electromagnetism is so great a subject that it may be regarded as coterminous only with all creation.

XVI. DESCRIPTION AND TRAVEL AS SOURCE MATERIAL FOR THE HISTORY OF EARLY AGRICULTURE IN PENNSYLVANIA

By RAYNER W. KELSEY
Haverford College

DESCRIPTION AND TRAVEL AS SOURCE MATERIAL FOR THE HISTORY OF EARLY AGRICULTURE IN PENNSYLVANIA

By Rayner W. Kelsey

INTRODUCTION

It is proposed to illustrate in this paper the type of material for agricultural history that may be gathered from works usually classified in libraries as "Description and travel." This material is fairly distinct from official documents such as customhouse records, agricultural laws, probate-court records, and departmental reports of various kinds. Some material, such as newspaper items, personal memoirs, and account books, does not always classify readily under either of the above headings, but usually in its nature and function belongs in the category of "Description and travel."

This type of material has destinctive value and definite limitations. It constantly supplies data, especially in the early periods of American history, that can be obtained from no other source. On the other hand, it must be used with care, for frequently the author was so shortsighted as not to foresee the obligation of accuracy that would be placed upon historians of later centuries.

For example, the present writer recently secured transcripts from the archives of Basel, Switzerland, of two descriptions of an early land project in South Carolina. They were letters written home by two actual settlers in the same vicinity at the same period. Each one described the climate, soil, products, labor conditions, etc. Then one of them declared the place to be an "earthly paradise," while the other called it "a damned fraud." It was a considerable discrepancy for the historian to wrestle with. Unfortunately the profane conclusion bore up better under the test of historical scrutiny.

In purely travel accounts something can usually be judged from the writer's general equipment for accurate observation. If he was a farmer himself, or for any reason especially interested in farm problems and progressive farming methods, his record is of course greatly enhanced in value. Fortunately, a good many early travelers were themselves farmers, interested in all the vital phases of farm practice.

In some cases a writer's accuracy in minor details may be checked at the present day, and thus some gauge be had of the general accuracy of his mental habits.

The present writer recently followed the trail of an eighteenth century traveler in Pennsylvania[1] and measured, by automobile speedometer, the distances indicated between stops. By checking the points covered by the early traveler during 15 days of travel, it was found that he had been surprisingly exact in his statement of distances. So in many other respects his accuracy stood the test. One more example may be cited. The early traveler visited a little lake or pond and recorded that it was "18 feet deep [and] peculiarly full of excellent trout."[2] The modern *voyageur* visited the same pond and made inquiries at the farm on its borders. After some casual remarks he asked the farm wife whether there were any fish in the pond. She answered, "plenty of trout." He then said, "The pond looks deep." "Yes," was the answer, "18 feet at the deepest." After a few such tests as that, one is justified in placing some dependence on the general accuracy of a journalist's observations.

It remains to illustrate in a few topical studies the value and availability of description and travel as source material. In these studies it will be necessary, as it always is, to supplement the account occasionally with materials not to be precisely classified under the above rubric. The main reliance will, however, be upon early travel and description.

SOIL IMPROVEMENT

In the early agriculture of Pennsylvania, as in other parts of America, precious little was thought or written about soil improvement.

It is of interest aud value, however, to follow such a topic in order to see the rise of a more progressive practice.

William Penn was forward looking in this matter, as in policies of statecraft. In 1686 he wrote as follows to the man whom he had selected to manage his farming project:

> I recommend to thee for the gardens and improvement of the lands, that ashes and soot . . . are excellent for the ground, grass, or corn. Soot may be gotten at Philadelphia for fetching, I suppose; it should be sowed pretty thick for corn, in Spring, not too thick; its best for low lands and such as are moist. Let me desire thee to lay down as much as thou canst with english grass and plow up new Indian fields and after a crop or two they must be laid down so too; for that feeds sheep, and that feeds the ground, as well as they feed and clothe us, and fitts it for grass, corn and wine.[3]

---

[1] Theophile Cazenove. See Cazenove Journal, 1794. Haverford College Studies, No. 13. Haverford, Pa., 1922.

[2] Cazenove Journal, 43.

[3] William Penn to James Harrison, in Penn MSS., Domestic and Misc., 32 (Historical Society of Pennsylvania).

That the father of Pennsylvania had a lively interest in farm problems is shown by his inclusion, in one of his early accounts of Pennsylvania, of a letter to him from Robert Turner. This letter tells of various experiments in farm practice tried by Turner. Among other things he tells of planting some patches of grass seed and using manure on part of it. The patch manured made the poorest growth.[4]

In 1698 Thomas's Account records that although limestone is plentiful and cheap, it is not used as fertilizer because of the natural fertility of the soil.[5] Here is an early admission of the deliberate policy of neglecting the soil and squandering its stored up wealth, the results of which bear heavily upon thousands of Pennsylvania farmers to-day.

From 1700 to 1750 almost nothing has been found on the subject of soil improvement, in an examination of the most promising collections of description and travel, manuscript and printed.

In the middle of the century Peter Kalm observed that there was little manure available because cattle were not housed in winter nor "tended" in the fields. Hence, he says, the fields are allowed to lie fallow a few years, after three years of grain raising.[6]

Near the middle of the century there was some discussion about the value of potash in agriculture, and some private correspondence between Philadelphia and London on the subject of a wonderful, secret fertilizer being perfected by the English writer that will "make Corn Grow in Barren and Sandy Ground."

Between 1775 and 1800 there is a great outcry against wasteful methods of soil exhaustion, and some amendment in this respect. A few scattering items may show the trend of the times:

1773. Alexander Thompson tells of buying a farm and finding the accumulated manure of 11 years piled up and unused. He hauled it to the fields and was rewarded with rich crops of wheat, rye, and Indian corn.[7]

About 1775 a traveler records that John Bartram, of Philadelphia, conducts spring water to his reservoir; then he throws in old lime, ashes, and horse dung and turns the water from the reservoir on his fields twice a week; he also spreads old hay, straw, and fodder on the ground in the fall. Thus he gets 53 hundredweight of hay per acre on land th t would hardly have grown "five fingers" before.[8]

1783. Farmers sometimes use lime and gypsum as fertilizer.[9] Schoepf records, 1783–84, that much lime is used on the land; it costs from 8d. to 13d. per bushel, Pennsylvania currency; on ordinary

[4] "Penn's Further Account" in Pennsylvania Magazine of History, IX, 74.
[5] In Myers Narratives of Pennsylvania, 320.
[6] In Pinkerton, Voyages, XIII, 410.
[7] In Pennsylvania Magazine of History, VIII, 321.
[8] Crèvecoeur, Letters (Everyman's ed.), 188–189.
[9] Pennsylvania Magazine of History, V, 76

upland they use from 15 to 20 bushels per acre; on clayey, low ground more than twice that amount.[10]

From this time forward there are frequent references by Schoepf, Cazenove, Liancourt, and others, to the use of lime, marl, gypsum, and barn manure. Rush says that Jacob Berger first used gypsum some years before the Revolution on a city lot in Philadelphia. Richard Peters indicates that he became acquainted with the use of gypsum in 1770.

A Pennsylvania farmer wrote in 1788 that plaster of Paris, lime, and marl act only as medicines or cordials upon the land; they give it a temporary activity which produces large crops and exhausts the soil; he quotes a German saying that plaster of Paris "makes rich children but poor grandchildren." His conclusion is that such fertilizers should be used only in conjunction with large quantities of stable manure, which he calls the only proper food for the earth.[11] This treatise of 1788 sounds almost like a current number of the Farmers' Bulletin published by the Department of Agriculture at Washington.

Even before the end of the century there is agitation for deeper plowing, better crop rotation, and for the proper preservation of manure. Then when the Memoirs of the Philadelphia Agriculture Society begin publication in 1808 we have available long and, one may say, scientific treatises on the use of all the above-mentioned fertilizers; on the construction of pits and shelters for manure, and on subsoil plowing and the proper rotation of crops.

The beginning, however, of real progress in soil improvement in Pennsylvania is in the last quarter of the eighteenth century.

WAGES AND WHEAT PRICES

A very interesting study would be to measure farm wages at various periods in terms of a representative group of farm products. A little step in that direction is taken here by comparing wages in terms of wheat. There is constant difficulty, because wages and the price of wheat differ considerably at different seasons of the year and in various localities, and it is often difficult to bring together data that represent similar conditions. Some approximate results may, however, be attained.

About 1682 wheat was running at 3s. 6d. per bushel in the neighborhood of Philadelphia. At the same time men could be hired at 15d. per day for clearing land.[12] Such a wage would amount to approximately 22 pounds of wheat, or just a little more than a third

[10] Schoepf, Travels (ed. 1911), II, 2-3.

[11] Pennsylvania Gazette, Apr. 9, 1788, p. 2.

[12] Pennsylvania Magazine, 333, 336, Myers, Narratives of Pennsylvania, 252.

of a bushel. Harvest help always came higher, and by comparison with other periods one would say that harvest help probably brought a half bushel of wheat per day, or a little more, in the early days of William Penn's settlement.

Figures for 1698 run almost the same, the maximum for harvest help running at almost exactly 30 pounds or a half bushel of wheat. In that year, however, common labor is quoted as low as 18d. per day, or 12 pounds of wheat.[13]

In 1725 wheat had risen to 4s. a bushel and winter labor would purchase 25 pounds of wheat per day, while a mower in harvest could buy as much as 38 pounds.[14]

In 1760, with wheat at 5s. 6d., labor is quoted at 4s. to 4s. 6d. By this score labor could purchase from 44 to 49 pounds of wheat per day.[15] This was during the French and Indian War and the comment is made in this year that "all prices including labor have risen." It is apparent, however, that labor prices had risen faster than the price of wheat.

For the year 1794 data are quite full for various parts of Pennsylvania. Wheat prices run from 7s. 6d. in Carlisle to 11s. 9d. near the Philadelphia market. An average price within a radius or 50 miles of Philadelphia is 10s. The figures on wages are somewhat uncertain because sometimes it is not specified whether board is included. At one place near Philadelphia wages are 3s. and board "and a pint of whiskey," where 70 years before they were 2s. 6d. "and a pint of rum"—showing small improvement in wages or temperance. On the whole, however, in 1794 labor would buy from 20 to 30 pounds of wheat per day but in most places, it was nearer the former figure.[16]

Thus we may conclude that in the century following the settlement by William Penn labor, measured in terms of wheat, had remained at nearly the same level, and would usually buy a little less than half a bushel. The choice of wheat as a measure is further justified in 1794 by a traveler in Berks County who states that farm laborers demanded payment in wheat.

(Data since 1800 have not been gathered, but it seems evident that in recent times the status of farm labor, as measured by wheat, has improved. By the writer's knowledge of conditions in several parts of eastern Pennsylvania before the Great War, and during the price fluctuations to 1917, a day's labor would buy from a bushel to a

[13] Pennsylvania Magazine, XVIII, 247: Myers, Narratives of Pennsylvania, 328.

[14] Pennsylvania Magazine, V, 350.

[15] Pennsylvania Gazette, Feb. 7, 1760, p. 3; Pemberton Papers (MSS., in Library of Historical Society of Pennsylvania), XIV, 71.

[16] Cazenove Journal, 28, 33, 34, 36, 59, 60, 67, 77; cf. "Letters and Documents" in Pennsylvania Magazine, V, 350.

bushel and a quarter of wheat, or more than twice as much as in the colonial period.)

THE CAZENOVE JOURNAL, 1794

Having illustrated the function of description and travel in two topical studies, it may be useful to close this paper with a cross-section view of one work of travel to show the variety of data that may be found in a single document of the kind.

One of the latest journals of early American travel to become available in print is the record kept by Theophile Cazenove in a journey across New Jersey and Pennsylvania in 1794. Cazenove was a Dutchman of French descent and at the time of his journey was general agent in America for the Holland Land Company. He was a keen observer, with a natural and also a professional interest in farm lands and farm problems of all sorts. Consequently his journal is a document par excellence on the agriculture of that period and on the whole round of life in that country.

Perhaps a fairly definite idea may given of the amount of material on various topics by stating the number of pages that contain items on each topic, with an occasional illustration of the type of information given.

First, some of the crops may be considered. For buckwheat one finds items on 17 pages, including culture, prices, and production per acre. He gives the production per acre in 10 different localities. It runs from 15 to 18 bushels in northern Jersey, and from 25 to 40 bushels in Pennsylvania. He even follows the buckwheat to the stage of buckwheat cakes, which, he says, the German farmers eat largely instead of bread because they are cheaper.[17]

Items on oats are found on 7 different pages; hay, 14 pages; barley, 10 pages; corn, 20 pages; wheat, 32 pages. On the subject of wheat there are 7 items on culture, 10 on prices, and 17 on the amount produced per acre. The production of wheat runs from 10 to 15 bushels per acre in Jersey, and from 15 to 20 bushels on the limestone soils of Pennsylvania. A study of Cazenove's figures in connection with a soil map of the districts traversed creates a strong presumption for the accuracy of the journalist.

There are four references to the ravages of the Hessian fly, the longest one being in the following paragraph on Chester County, Pa.:

> An acre of good valley land generally yields 15 to 20 bushels of wheat, but these last 2 or 3 years they have been annoyed in this district by the Hessian fly and this year (1794) by mildew—so they cultivate corn more extensively, and sow their fields in clover, because when there is not enough wheat sown, the Hessian fly attacks barley.[18]

---

[17] Cazenove Journal, 34.

[18] Cazenove Journal, 77.

On various other subjects Cazenove supplies data as follows: Cattle, items on 9 different pages; horses, 9 pages; prices of farm lands, 30 pages; use or nonuse of manure, 5 pages; transportation of produce, 9 pages; farm buildings, 8 pages; butter prices, 10 pages; size of farms, 24 pages; farm wages, 11 pages.

The following is an example of the condensed information given by Cazenove for the vicinity of Lebanon, Pa.:

In Lebanon, flour costs —, butcher's meat 5 pence a pound, fresh pork 6 pence, butter 1 s [hilling]; walnut wood 2 dollars a cord, oak wood 10 s [hillings] a cord.

A workman earns 3 s. per day, and ½ dollar in summer.

For fertilizer, lime, which is plentiful here; plow with two horses.

[Rotation] New ground here:

1st year, wheat
2 " wheat again
3 " oats
4 " fallow, rest
5 " wheat
6 " fallow, etc.

Lands cultivated a longer time:

1st year, wheat
2 " barley
3 " corn, or oats
4 " fallow, or buckwheat
5 " if buckwheat the 4th year, then fallow.

The cattle stay in the stables from December to April.

Board per week in private house, 2 dollars.

Now prices are: wheat 9 shillings per bushel, corn 5 s., barley 7-1/2 s., oats 2/6 (the army 3/6); hay £4.10 per ton now, it being in the barn; £3.15 to 4, taken directly from the fields.

([Side endorsement]: The carting of a ton of hay from here to Philadelphia is from £5 to£6, if the road is bad; 2 s./6 for a bushel of grain.)[19]

Of course one finds useful and plentiful data on manners and customs. Description and travel excel particularly in this field. This paper may be closed by a quotation, semiinformational, semiphilosophical, showing Cazenove's reaction to the German farmers of Pennsylvania. Readers who may be of German ancestry will perhaps make allowance for the fact that Theophile Cazenove was of French descent.

The German farmers also manufacture coarse woolen material for coats, skirts, etc.; and all their shirt-linens; they buy only their best clothes, for Sunday, and not many of these, as they are thrifty to the point of avarice; to keep seems ? to be their great passion; they live on potatoes; and buckwheat cakes instead of bread. They deny themselves everything costly; but when there is snow, they haunt the taverns. They are remarkably obstinate and ignorant.

On every farm they cultivate enough flax and hemp and also raise what sheep they need for making their linen and cloth. They have a few gardens, at least for cabbage and carrots, and they all have bee-hives. You always feel like settling in the country when you see the excellent ground and the charm of the country, and also the advantage of farming, but you lose courage when you realize the total lack of education of the farmers, and that it is absolutely necessary to live to yourself, if you

[19] Cazenove Journal, 48-49.

have any education, knowledge and feeling. There ought to be 5 or 6 families living close together in these districts; then they would be very happy, for freedom and abundance are obtained in a thousand places of the United States, if you are sensible and diligent; but for society—*nescio vos*.

All these farmers talk politics; and because they read the papers, they think they know a great deal about the government; they think that government officers are too many and overpaid. One of these was complaining about the government excise and wanted a land-tax, but I pacified him with an argument for those who never generalize ideas—a land-tax, I told him, is against liberty, because every one must pay it if he has land, while the excise can be avoided if you want to—in order to do so, do not distill or drink any intoxicating drinks.[20]

It might be added that Cazenove's advice about avoiding intoxicating drinks was purely philosophical, never practical on his own part. Yet whatever his principles or practices on the temperance question, he has given us a storehouse of information on the farming methods and conditions of his day, and his journal is a worthy example of the source material for agricultural history that may be classified under the heading of "Description and travel."

[20] Cazenove Journal, 34–35.

XVII. THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES IN THE UNITED STATES

By RODNEY H. TRUE
University of Pennsylvania

THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES IN THE UNITED STATES

By Rodney H. True

In the first half of the eighteenth century English agriculture began to reap the harvest resulting from the sowing of the preceding century. The steady passing of the land from the irresponsible, inflexible, community tenure of the Middle Ages to individual ownership had already begun to tell in the increased effectiveness of individual initiative. New crops and methods from the ever efficient Netherlands had given the English farmer clover and turnips; America had contributed the potato. The improvement of roads had increased the ease of communication and thereby speeded up the propagation of new ideas and increased the range of individual observation. Crop rotation, a cardinal feature of farming operations since Roman times, was receiving more intelligent attention, and the fallow, in the old sense, was beginning to be doubted. Stock raising was recognized as a complement to crop growing, not an alternative. Tull had begun his agricultural revolution based on tillage.

In view of the general activity of these times, some kind of united effort would be expected as a natural result. The Scotch apparently secured the priority when in 1723 the Edinburgh Society of Improvers in the Knowledge of Agriculture in Scotland was founded. Lord Stair, taking the lead, organized those interested in the problem of the land. This society became prominent through the publication in 1743 of Maxwell's Select Transactions.

In 1731 Ireland followed Scotland, and the Dublin Society was established under the ægis of government. Not only were communications published, but a farm for the carrying on of experiments was established under the care of an official experimentalist. This advanced step was made possible by the very considerable financial support from the government.

England caught the step in 1754 when the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce was organized in London. The program of this society was broader than that of the earlier Scotch and Irish societies, but due attention was given to

agriculture as a part of the effort. After some decades (1783) it, too, published its transactions.

In point of time, the next society of this nature that has come to my attention was organized in 1765, in Russia, under direct orders of the Empress Catherine. The Free Oeconomical Society, as it was called, began immediately to print its treatises. A large experimental establishment was set up near St. Petersburg under the charge of a Russian clergyman who had studied scientific agriculture in England on Arthur Young's estate. It was planned that a certain number of young men, later to become priests, were to be brought from different parts of Russia for a training that was to be carried by them to their future parishioners.

In 1766 the government of France took the lead in still another direction, founding the celebrated veterinary school at Charenton, near Paris. This was later transferred to Rambouillet, where it became world famous. In 1786 a farm for experimental purposes was annexed to it and four professorships were established; two in rural economy, one in anatomy, and one in chemistry. (Young's Travels in France, Bohn. Libr. 1912: 99.)

The first American society for the advancement of agriculture, known to the writer, the New York Society for Promoting Arts, was already organized in 1766.[1] In that year it offered premiums for papers or reports concerning practical work done on specific subjects to which the society wished to direct the attention of the farmers.

England showed great activity in the following decades by developing many county societies, some of special significance, as the Bath and West of England Society in 1777.

Several American societies fall within this period, as the South Carolina Agricultural Society, 1784, the Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Agriculture, 1785, the New York society, 1791, and others following closely.

It is our task to study the general features of these American organizations, their composition, purposes and methods of operation. In most cases one or more prominent men of a leading city took the initiative and rallied around themselves a group of the well-to-do public-spirited citizens of their neighborhood who took a more or less active interest in the improvement of agricultural conditions.

At the very beginning a cleavage line between the agricultural and manufacturing interests is detected and a conscientious effort seems to have been made in many societies to overcome this by attempts to demonstrate the identity of interests. These societies were organized to better the circumstances of the overwhelmingly

[1] New York Gazette, Mar. 13, 1766: New York Mercury, Mar. 10, 1766: Weekly Post Boy, Mar. 13, 1766.

preponderant agricultural population, but as the political strife raged more and more savagely during the decades following the Revolution traces of political discord are sometimes discoverable in the activities of these groups. In general, these organizations show a tendency to side with the liberals rather than with the conservatives. The antagonism between agriculture and manufactures, in spite of diligent efforts at suppression, would at times break out. While conservatives like Timothy Pickering and John Adams of Massachusetts, were active in the early days, the liberal wing usually took the lead vigorously in later decades.

Passing now to the details of organization, it may be said that, while variations in the minor points of the plan were found, these young American societies followed pretty closely the British pattern as worked out in the county societies. Membership, while not exclusive, was guarded to the end that members secured would be able and willing to meet the dues, while proposals and consideration for a period prior to election to membership seem to have been the rule. The members paid into the treasury an annual fee that even in these days would be respectable, thus raising a fund that could be devoted to meeting the modest expenses of the organization and to paying very substantial premiums for the best papers on specific subjects, or for the best production of specified crops grown under indicated conditions. These premiums were sometimes cash sums, sometimes silver plate. The latter was quite the rule in the Southern States, but perhaps less often such in the Middle and Northern States.

As specimen subjects for which premiums were offered by the Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Agriculture for the year 1791 the following may be cited:

Rotation of crops, having been found capable in England of improving the soil instead of exhausting it, it is deemed important that the farmers of Pennsylvania should acquaint themselves with this mode of husbandry. Accordingly, for the best experiment of a five years' course of crops a piece of silver plate of the value of $200 is offered, inscribed with the name and the occasion. For the experiment made of a like course of crops next in merit, a piece of plate likewise inscribed is offered of a value of $100.

The importance of the giving the best shelter to cattle and in such a way as to procure the greatest quantities of manure from within the farm leads the society to offer a gold medal for the best design of farm yard and method of managing it from the points of view noted. A silver medal is offered for the second best offering.

The best method of raising hogs—gold and silver medals for best and second best plans, respectively.

For the best method of recovering worn-out fields to a more healthy state, within the power of common farmers, without dear or far-fetched manures; but by judicious culture and the application of materials common to the generality of farms; founded on experience—a gold medal and a silver medal as before.

For the best information, the result of actual experience, for preventing the damage to crops by insects, especially the Hessian fly [discovered but a few years before]—gold and silver medals.

For the best comparative experiments on the culture of wheat, broadcast, drilled, or with the seed spaced at equal distances—gold and silver medals.

A vegetable food, easily procured and preserved, that best increases milk in cows and ewes in March and April founded on experiment—gold and silver medals.

For the greatest quantity of ground, not less than one acre, well fenced, producing locust trees growing in 1791 from seeds sown after April 5, 1785, to be of a sort used for posts and trunnels, and not fewer than 1,500 per acre—again medals.

Wishing to emphasize the use of oxen instead of horses in husbandry and other services and the value of improved herds, the society offers a gold medal for the best essay based on experience in the breeding, feeding, and management of cattle for the purpose of rendering them most profitable for the dairy and for beef, and most docile and useful for the draught—a silver medal for the next best plan.

To ascertain the powers of oxen as draught animals when hitched up as horses are hitched, or on some better plan if there is such, when used on plough or loaded carriage—medals are offered; methods and expense of shoeing, harnessing, etc. to be described.

A footnote refers to the common use of oxen in New England, something apparently rare in Pennsylvania.

To find the best method of recovering old gullied fields to a hearty state, or when damaged beyond remedy, how best to use them, as for tree planting—medals.

For the best cheese, not less than 500 pounds—gold medal; not less than 250 pounds—silver medal.

The society, believing that the culture of hemp on some of the low rich lands in the neighborhood of this city may be attempted with advantage, offers a gold medal for the greatest quantity of hemp, not less than 3 tons, grown within 10 miles of Philadelphia. For second greatest quantity, a silver medal.

A final provision allows the successful candidates for prizes to receive either plate or medal, or their cash equivalent.

The society awarded prizes on the basis of written reports properly certified by competent witnesses. The pithy recommendation "That reasoning be not mixed with the facts" accompanies the statement of conditions of competition. It will be noted that premiums were not offered for definite itemized products, but rather for the best solutions of problems of general significance.

Here we have the general type illustrated. Variations in minor particulars are found among the different societies, as the problems to be solved varied with each region concerned.

The leaders of these early American societies seem to have realized that in holding meetings and listening to reports on experiments they were but half accomplishing their object. Greater numbers must be reached through some sort of printed medium. For some years they seem to have used the newspapers, almanacs, and other general periodical literature open to them. In time, several of the stronger organizations, following the conspicuous lead of the Bath and West of England, Highland, Dublin, and other Old World societies, issued volumes of memoirs or transactions, in which selected papers were printed for their membership and indirectly for a wider circle of readers. Among the societies doing so, the following may be cited as

examples: South Carolina Agricultural Society (1785); New York Society for Agriculture, Arts, and Manufactures (1792); Massachusetts Society for Promoting Agriculture (1796).[2]

None of the American societies, so far as known, was able to imitate Dublin and the Oeconomical Society of Russia in establishing experimental farms. Institutions founded on the voluntary contributions of a general membership could hardly have expected to undertake an enterprise requiring so large and steady a support.

However, in 1794 a committee of the Philadelphia Society, of which John Beal Bordley, colonial judge of the Admiralty at Annapolis, Md., and in his later years a resident of Philadelphia, acted as chairman, petitioned the State legislature to incorporate a State Society of Agriculture in Pennsylvania, which, among other objects, would establish "pattern farms" in different and convenient parts of the State in charge of competent men. Incidentally this same committee urged that books presenting sound principles and methods of farming be used in the county schools, the masters being enjoined to combine the teaching of agriculture with the other subjects of education.[3] The national farm established by the French government in 1783 was cited as an example of such a pattern farm.[4] The actual establishment of such pattern farms for the general diffusion of information was not accomplished, I believe, in the early days in Pennsylvania or in any other State.

Although the giving of agricultural instruction, carried on very effectively in a private way by Arthur Young, was urged by this committee of the Philadelphia society, the formal teaching of agriculture does not seem to have passed beyond the point of animated discussion even in that State. This idea, however, was generally discussed about this time by many leaders of American thought, Washington and Jefferson among the number.

The general model on which these early agricultural societies was based is to be found in the learned societies of the times. The American Philosophical Society, organized in 1743 at Philadelphia, published many articles on agricultural subjects long before this branch of interest segregated itself. Hence it was natural that the early agricultural societies should preserve somewhat of the aristocratic character of their prototypes and, like them, should fail to reach the men who actually held the plow. How to popularize agricultural improvement and to bring not only the idea but concrete illustrations of it to the men on the land was a problem for the agricultural leaders to solve. One result of the effort to do this took the form of agricultural exhibitions in which the farmers themselves competed for premiums

[2] Phil. Soc. Prom. Agri. 4: xx.
[3] Mem. Phila. Soc. Prom. Agri., 1: xxi.
[4] Ibid., 1: xxv.

offered for specified products. This sort of extension work, in which the principles advocated by advanced thinkers were given the form of more and better grains, fruits, and animals, marked the transition of these societies from the Old World aristocratic type of learned organization to a much larger democratic institution that dealt much less with ideas and much more with everyday realities.

This movement in America ran roughly parallel with a like development in the mother country. Probably the germ of the new thing was to be found in the occasional popular gatherings on the premises of Coke of Holkham, in Norfolk, who from 1778 to 1821 annually gathered his farmers together for consultation on agricultural matters and to study on his highly improved lands the results of better methods. All were welcome from the smallest tenant farmer to His Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex.[5] The exhibition of horses, pigs, and implements of husbandry was followed by the shearing of sheep. Fleeces were weighed and different types of sheep were killed and their mutton value determined. As the climax of the occasion, a grand dinner was served, with toasts drunk in the orthodox manner and with the customary speeches.

This type of demonstration work was imitated in America by several leading citizens. George Washington Parke Custis began his series of annual sheep shearings in 1802 at Arlington, across the Potomac from Washington.[6] Here the model set by Coke was as closely followed as circumstances would permit.[7]

Col. David Humphreys, formerly minister to Spain, and Robert R. Livingstone at a little later date (1810) followed the example of Coke and Somerville and invited gatherings to their premises where sheep were sheared, speeches made, and toasts drunk in good English style.[8] The popularity of these gatherings and their effectiveness as a means of arousing and broadening interest in better agriculture was apparently promptly recognized by the agricultural societies. Many soon organized exhibitions at which not only were sheep sheared but the greater variety of subjects of interest to a farming population was recognized in a program of much broader scope.

The question of priority in holding agricultural exhibitions brings to view one of the most interesting men of those days in the person of Elkanah Watson, a man of wide public experience who was much interested in the improvement of agricultural conditions. In the autumn of 1807 Watson determined to make the arrival of two merino sheep that he had just bought a matter of general interest to the

[5] Curtler, Short History of English Agriculture, 227. For a lively account of the three days' meeting in autumn of 1820, see American Farmer, 2: 217.

[6] Connor, Brief History of the Sheep Industry in the United States, An. Rpt. Am. Hist. Assoc. 1918, I: 99.

[7] Bryan, W. B., A History of the National Capital, I: 597; also Lossing, Benson, J., The American Centenary, 1876: 107.

[8] Agr. Museum 1: 35, 4, 1810.

farmers of Pittsfield, Berkshire County, Mass., where he was then living. He gave notice that he would exhibit these animals under the great elm tree in the public square. He took this occasion to make an enthusiastic speech in the interest of improved stock. An agricultural society was duly chartered in 1810, and in the fall of 1811 held a formal exhibition with an award of about $70 to the most meritorious animals. Other interests than those of livestock were not recognized on account of a lack of funds. Anyone who enjoys a bit of enthusiastic writing should read Watson's account of his exhibition.[9]

It seems clear that unless Watson's speech to the Berkshire farmers over his two merinos, under the great elm in Pittsfield square, constituted an agricultural exhibition in the accepted sense, Massachusetts was anticipated one year by the District of Columbia. Here, on the outskirts of Georgetown, on May 16, 1810, an exhibition was held about which there could be little doubt. Not two sheep and an enthusiastic orator only, but a list of premiums was awarded for sheep to the amount of $240; for domestic manufactures, $260; "for shearing a sheep in the neatest, safest and most expeditious manner" $15 awarded to a resident of the city of Washington. Apparently the palm for priority goes to the District of Columbia.[10]

It is to be noted that in both exhibitions the only animals recognized were sheep. To offset this may be cited another activity of the exhibition type in which cattle were the chief object of interest. Cattle shows were held in England from 1802 onward under the patronage of Lord Somerville.[11] The Smithfield cattle show, begun in 1793, was an effort on a wider basis.[12] In America, too, cattle had their own special appreciation, and that mainly in the Northern and Central States. Here, about the exhibits of fat cattle grouped a variety of features similar to that seen at the southern sheep shearings. In most cases both North and South, as in the District of Columbia, domestic manufactures were given special emphasis.

It will be seen that in these exhibitions, or shows, or shearings, the different elements of the rural life of the times were gradually being brought together. The problem of agricultural implements, even in the early days, appealed to Americans. Jared Eliot, the author of our first American work on agriculture, with the assistance of President Clapp of Yale College, devised a drill plow based on the rather clumsy type developed before 1735 by Tull in England. Eliot sent one of these machines to William Logan in Philadelphia in 1755. Americans, thrown on their own resources in these matters, were forced to

[9] Watson, Men and Times of the Revolution : 368.
[10] Agri. Museum, 1 : 11, 1810.
[11] Agri. Museum, 1: 49, 1810.
[12] Curtler: 218.

make tools to fit their needs. The plow had always been an object of special difficulty because, until Jefferson's time, each tool was a thing by itself, made of wood on a plan favored by the individual plowright and finished off with sundry iron parts furnished by the blacksmith. No two plows were exactly alike. A favorite implement was kept as long as possible, then duplicated as nearly as might be.

This condition of affairs, in respect to this most important implement and observations, made on the almost Neolithic plows seen at work in 1795 by Jefferson while touring in Lorraine led that statesman to seek some principle of construction that might standardize plows on a rational basis. He worked on this problem until by 1793 he was able to formulate his principles in terms of mathematics, and to have plows made on his design.[13] They were used on his Virginia estates and worked admirably. A discussion of the problem with his solution was presented to the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia in 1798.[14] He used a spring dynamometer to ascertain the actual draft of plows of different designs.

It will be readily understood from this explanation how alive the problem of the plow was a decade or so later in the days of these cattle shows, sheep shearings, and agricultural exhibitions. The plowing match was seen as a regular feature on most of these occasions. Sometimes contests were held between horses and oxen. Generally plowmakers from several places would enter their handiwork, and, following the example of the patron of the arts and sciences from Monticello, put their products to the strict tests of the dynamometer.

For some years exhibitions of the types described went under a variety of names—sheep shearings, cattle shows, agricultural exhibitions. After a time another name came to be associated with these, namely—the fair.

Fairs had been established institutions in the Old World from relatively remote times, coming into existence with the improvement of roads and means of conveyance. About 1600, horse fairs were held at Ripon, Harborow, Wolf Pit, and other places in England.[15] The great market for hops and wool was found at the Sturbridge Fair,[16] the great market for sheep at the Wayhill Fair in 1719.[17] In the day of Coke, St. Faith's Fair near Norwich was a central point for the sale of cattle, some even coming from Scotland to be fattened for the London market.[18]

---

[13] Randall, Trans. N. Y. State Agr. Soc., 22: 67, 1862.

[14] Trans. Am. Phil. Soc., 4: 313-322, 1799.

[15] Curtler: 105.

[16] Ibid., 171.

[17] Ibid., 172.

[18] Prothero, English Farming, Past and Present, 218.

In America, fairs for the exhibition and sale of livestock, home manufactures, and produce were well known at a relatively early date. A Virginia act of 1742 sanctioned the holding of semiannual fairs in Alexandria in the spring and fall. In Maryland the act laying out the town of Georgetown in 1751 gave the same authority to this place. The Virginia enactment indicated that these fairs should afford an opportunity for "the sale and vending of all manner of cattle, victuals, provisions, goods, wares, and merchandises."[19] After the city of Washington had begun to take shape in 1804, the city council authorized the holding of fairs "for the sale of all kinds of cattle, goods, wares, and merchandise" in May and November of each year. In addition to the opportunities for selling merchandise, premiums were offered for the best specimens of the various kinds of livestock sold during the fair. Here, along with the exchange feature, the improvement motive had begun to develop before the agricultural societies had adopted it as an extension feature of their more formal and strictly intellectual proceedings.

Even earlier, however, than Virginia and Maryland, Carolina had been holding fairs in the vicinity of Charleston. The South Carolina Gazette of May 5, 1733, states that "on Tuesday next Strawberry Fair will begin as usual." In the number of September 28, 1734, occurs the notice of the fair as an annual event at Strawberry. That real estate, as well as produce and livestock, was also sold at this fair is indicated by a notice in the Gazette of the same date that two "Town lotts in Childsberry alias the Strawberry" would "be sold for ready money to the highest bidder at publick Out-Cry," at the next Strawberry Fair in the month of October.

The Strawberry Fair seems to have been first authorized by an act of 1723, establishing it at Childsberry town in St. John's Parish, in Berkeley County. Public fairs were to be held "at least twice in every year for exposing for sale horses, cattle, and merchandise." "Anything may be brought there by anybody for sale or barter at such times, hours and seasons as directors or rulers at the Fairs at the time may appoint." A further most interesting provision follows: "Fairs shall be held with a Court of Pipowder with liberties and customs of Fairs such as are holden in South Britain or England." The duties of the rulers of the fair appointed by the governor of the province in holding court of pipowder are defined. The further provision is made that "during Fair no one there shall be liable to arrest by virtue of any process except treason, felony or other capital crime, or breach of the peace."

An act of March 16, 1783, is somewhat more explicit concerning this court. The establishment of a "court of pipowder" is provided

[19] Bryan, History of National Capital, I: 60, 1914.

for. A majority of the inhabitants of the town were authorized to elect a person or persons as directors or rulers of the fair, which directors or rulers were authorized to hold a "court of pipowders together with all liberty and free customs to such appertaining, and that they and every one of them may have and hold there, at their respective courts, from day to day and hour to hour from time to time upon all occasions plaints and please of a court of pipowders, together with all summons, attachments, arrests, issues, fines, redemptions and commodities."

The court of pipowder was derived immediately from early English usage, as is indicated in the language of the act. The name, "the court of dusty feet," as well as this form of temporary petty tribunal, came from France, where at maritime points this international emergency court grew up at the fairs held in the Middle Ages. Such was apparently the remote origin of the temporary courts, with their constables, having limited powers of action, named for the duration of the fair.[20]

We get traces of this element in the machinery of agricultural fairs from the beginnings of these institutions down to the present time.

Such was the early origin and character of the fairs that furnished a favorable stock onto which the post-revolutionary agricultural societies grafted their extension operations. Already established as occasions that brought many people together, and therefore popular as social events in days when the social side of farm life had little chance, these societies needed only to guide this activity into the desired channels. By offering premiums for individual animals or articles of definite kinds, the society officers directed the attention of the community toward such objects as seemed to them to be of major importance. By varying the objects for which premiums were offered, or by regulating the sums offered, it was possible to bring new ideas to the front and to point out new needs to be met. Thus the premium lists of any society of long life throw a very strong light on farming conditions as they existed in the beginning and as they changed with time. Thus, also, the fairs, originally, as the name suggests, places of purchase and barter, changed their character as the propaganda spirit took possession of them. They retained, and retain to this day, the name "fair," but the original element gradually vanished before the improving spirit of the agricultural societies that took charge of them.

Another institution that originated independently of the agricultural fairs and finally gravitated to them was the horse race. From very early times horse racing had been a favorite form of amusement, and the elements of popularity were recognized by the early agricul-

[20] Holdsworth, The Law Merchant, Select Essays in Anglo-American Legal History, vol. 1, also Selden Society, Select Cases of Law Merchant, 1270-1638, vol. 1. Introduction.

tural organizers as likely to furnish a means of advancing agriculture. Horses were the chief means of travel for all parts of the country from early times, and from saddle use to racing was a short step. The breeding of saddle horses was carried on in the latter half of the seventeenth century, in Rhode Island[21], among other places. This was the possible source of saddle horses advertised for sale in Charleston, S. C., at a somewhat later date. Edward Vanvelsen, in the South Carolina Gazette of September 14, 1734, offered for sale "Two Rhode Island Stallions, Natural Pacers," both 15 hands high. On January 4, 1735, Nathaniel Potter offered for sale "at his store at Mr. William Pinckney's several Rhode Island pacing horses," Molasses, Cyder Potatoes, etc.

At an early date horse racing was already a public institution in Charleston. A race having for a prize a saddle valued at 20 pounds was advertised as an attraction at a fair held in May, 1737, at Ashley Ferry.[22]

Horse racing began in Georgetown, Md., as early as 1769, and in the spring of 1797 a great race of 4-mile heats was run in Washington, the chief contestants being horses owned by Charles Ridgeley of Maryland and Colonel Tayloe of Virginia. A great interstate rivalry made this race one long remembered.[23]

Although racing was thus already established in the area included in the District of Columbia years before the agricultural exhibition held in Georgetown in 1810, the races were not associated with it. Perhaps the agricultural exhibition was still too intent on the serious business for which it was organized to seek the aid of a sport then, as now, not without its shady side. Indeed, it seems to have been decades later before the horse race was drawn into the synthesis, and then often with a sort of half apology.

From what I have outlined here, the following conclusions may be gathered:

With the general awakening to the importance of agricultural improvement in the early seventeen hundreds, organizations intended to forward this movement were formed both in Europe and in America. Membership was limited in number, and the scientific and philosophical organizations of the time formed the prototype. Efforts to widen the circle of influence included the publishing of memoirs and transactions, and the offering of premiums for solutions to problems. A further widening was sought by applying the demonstration principle, the result being exhibits at which products were put in competi-

[21] Weeden, Social and Economic History of New England; 333.
[22] South Carolina Gazette, Apr. 16, 1737.
[23] Bryan, History of National Capital, 1:304.

tion for prizes. Other features of popular interest, agricultural in nature, gradually gathered about this exhibit to build up an institution that had a very broad appeal, and through its effect on great numbers of farmers hastened very greatly the dissemination of new information, awakened the spirit of improvement and made concrete the work of intellectual leaders.

As effort centered more and more on the application of principles to practice the intellectual level of these societies declined. However, they achieved democracy and thereby accomplished a great work.

XVIII. HISTORY OF THE RANCH CATTLE INDUSTRY IN OKLAHOMA

By EDWARD EVERETT DALE

University of Oklahoma

HISTORY OF THE RANCH CATTLE INDUSTRY IN OKLAHOMA.

EDWARD EVERETT DALE

This paper deals with that period of time from the beginning of ranching in Oklahoma upon a large scale to statehood in 1907—the period of the ranch cattle industry. The subject is treated from an historical rather than an economic viewpoint, omitting so far as possible statistics and questions of profit and loss in order to devote more space to governmental relations and the influence of cattle raising in Oklahoma upon the development of the West and upon the country as a whole.

It has seemed well to limit the subject in this way, because cattle raising in Oklahoma, during the period named, was far different from that industry in any other State of the Union and its peculiar features had a powerful and far-reaching influence. Broadly speaking, the history of the ranch cattle industry in Oklahoma is merely a part of the history of a much larger movement—that of the conquest of the American wilderness. This movement has been characterized by the appearance of various successive stages of society, that of the hunter, the herder, and the pioneer farmer. The significant thing is that Oklahoma has passed through all of these stages within a single generation, owing to the fact that Oklahoma was a region of retarded development, since it was an Indian territory in which white settlement was for a long time forbidden.

Cattle ranching as a frontier pursuit has existed in America since early colonial days. Once agricultural settlement was firmly planted along the Atlantic seaboard and began its march westward across the continent, pushing before it the broken fragments of various Indian tribes, there was always to be found along its western edge a comparatively narrow rim or border of pastoral life. For a century and more it was there, pushed on steadily west as agricultural settlement advanced, a sort of "twilight zone" with the light of civilization behind it and the darkness of savagery before. It is one of the most remarkable things in American economic history, however, that immediately after the Civil War this comparatively narrow belt of pastoral life, hitherto fairly constant in width and area, suddenly shot out into the wilderness and spread with remarkable rapidity

until it covered a region larger than all that part of the United States east of the Mississippi devoted to agriculture.[1]

Among the factors chiefly responsible for this sudden and enormous expansion of the industry were the slaughter of the buffalo, thus leaving vast areas of excellent pasture lands entirely without animals to consume the grass; and the gathering up of the Plains tribes of Indians and the placing of them upon reservations in Oklahoma and elsewhere.[2]

The last was somewhat dependent upon the former. It was virtually impossible to keep the roving tribes of the Plains upon reservations as long as there were plenty of buffalo to be found, a potential supply of food, clothing, and shelter. But by 1880 the buffalo had almost entirely disappeared and after that date it was comparatively easy to keep the Indians upon reservations where they were fed by the Government of the United States.[3] Thus the destruction of the buffalo herds not only opened up a vast pastoral region by leaving the grass formerly consumed by these animals for cattle, but it also made it possible for the ranchmen to occupy that region with some degree of safety, since the Indians could then be controlled and kept upon their own lands.

Even so, it would have been impossible for the ranching industry to have grown to such great proportions so rapidly, because enough animals could not have been found to stock these enormous new ranges, had there not existed in the Southwest a great reservoir from which they might be drawn—the State of Texas. That Commonwealth, with an area greater than the combined areas of the thirteen original States, was an ideal region for cattle raising. Climate, soil, and the land system all combined to make this true. The winters were usually mild so that cattle kept fat upon the open range throughout the year; the soil usually produced a good quality of grass, while the system inherited from Spain of granting out lands in large tracts had made Texas a region of large landed proprietors, most of whom had herds of cattle.[4]

During the four years of the Civil War Texas remained the least touched of any Southern State by that struggle. While the armies of Sherman were laying waste a broad strip through Georgia and the Carolinas, while the border States were being devastated by the troops of both sides, and while the fields of the Cotton Kingdom were lying

---

[1] Nimmo gives the area devoted to the range cattle industry in 1885 as 1,350,000 square miles; a region larger than the combined areas of Great Britain, Ireland, France, Germany, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Austria (as it then was), Italy, Spain, Portugal, and one-fifth of Russia in Europe. See Nimmo, Range and Ranch Cattle Traffic of the U. S., p. 1.

[2] Some 20 tribes of Plains Indians were brought to western Oklahoma and located upon reservations there between 1866 and 1885.

[3] The disappearence of the buffalo may be traced in the reports of the Indian agents for the western tribes of Oklahoma. See Reports of Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1876, pp. 46-49; ibid, 1879, p. 65.

[4] The census of 1860, Volume on agriculture, p. 148, gives the total number of cattle in Texas at that time as 3,534,768. Census figures are most unreliable, however, when applied to an industry of this nature, and those of that particular census are especially so.

fallow for want of laborers to till them, the cattle herds of Texas remained undisturbed and were increasing rapidly under the favorable conditions surrounding them. The result was that when the Texas soldiers returned to their homes at the close of the war they found their ranges overflowing with fine fat cattle for which they had no market though cattle and beef were selling at high prices in the North.[5]

Out of this condition grew the so-called "northern drive." Early in 1866 many Texas ranchmen gathered up herds of fat steers and drove them northward in an effort to reach market. Finding it almost impossible to drive cattle through the settled regions that must be traversed in order to reach Kansas City or St. Louis, they soon began to keep to the west of all settlements and bring their herds to shipping points on the railroads building westward through Kansas and Nebraska, which came to be known as "cow towns." Here the cattle were loaded on cars and shipped to the northern or eastern markets.[6]

It is estimated that between five and six million head of cattle were driven north from Texas during the 18 years following the Civil War, and it seems probable that this estimate is too low.[7] The fat animals were shipped to the packing centers to be slaughtered; others were sent into the corn belt where they were fed corn for from 60 to 120 days before being consigned to the packers. Also, it was not long until the possibilities of the northern ranges were discovered, with the result that the drive to Abilene, Wichita, or Dodge City frequently became but the first part of a longer drive to Dakota, Montana, or Wyoming. It was found that both the northern and southern plains had their advantages. Texas, because of the low altitude and warm climate, remained the great breeding ground, while the northern plains became the great feeding ground; many men held ranges in both regions.

As time went on the ranch cattle industry grew in popularity. Ranching became almost a fad. Young college men from the East, as the late Theodore Roosevelt, to quote a conspicuous example, came West and engaged in the business. Foreign capitalists invested heavily in ranching ventures, and a number of these, such as Baron Richthofen and the Marquis of Mores, came over from Europe and gave their personal attention to the business. A literature of the cattle country came into existence. Large corporations were formed,

[5] In 1866 round steak was retailing in New York at 20 to 25 cents a pound, sirloin at 25 to 35, and rib roast at 28 to 30 cents (New York Tribune, June 23, 1866). On the live stock market of eastern cities cattle were quoted at $5 to $10 per hundredweight the last-named price being refused on the Albany market Dec. 21, 1866, for a choice consignment of Illinois steers (New York Times, Dec. 22, 1866).

[6] See Joseph G. McCoy, Historic Sketches of the Texas Cattle Trade, for a contemporary account of the development of the northern drive.

[7] Nimmo, Range and Ranch Cattle Traffic, p. 28.

in many of which prominent State and national officials held stock. Within 10 years after the close of the Civil War the industry of herding had spread over the entire Plains region and extended from the edge of the agricultural settlements on the east to the Rocky Mountains and even beyond.

In the very center of this great "cow country" lay the Indian Territory, later to become the State of Oklahoma, a region larger than all New England, yet with a population of hardly more than a hundred thousand souls. Obviously it was a "strategic region," since it lay between the breeding grounds of Texas and both the markets and feeding grounds of the North, and in consequence nearly all of the cattle trails leading north crossed it. It was also interesting in itself. The eastern half was occupied by the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians who owned their lands in common and governed themselves almost as though they were five independent republics. These people, through contact with the whites in their old home east of the Mississippi, had passed from the hunting to the pastoral stage of society, but at this point had been driven westward to Oklahoma. Here they had continued the herding industry begun in the old home, but their herds were destroyed by the Civil War and their country so devastated that after that struggle they never reached the point in cattle raising that they had previously attained. The western half of the Indian Territory, with an area as great as that of Ohio, had less than 20,000 half savage blanket Indians living upon large reservations of which they made little use, while certain extensive areas such as Greer County, Old Oklahoma, and the Cherokee Outlet had no Indian inhabitants at all.[8]

White settlement was forbidden in this territory and, as an agricultural population slowly crept westward engulfing it, Oklahoma remained an attractive but little inhabited island of wilderness in the midst of swirling currents of civilization. It was as though a dike had been erected about the Indian country by governmental decree, a dike impervious to the waves of settlement that beat against it.

---

[8] The Indians located in Oklahoma were as follows:
Osage, 1872, 17 Stats. 228.
Kaw, 1872, 17 Stats. 228.
Ponca Sioux, 1877, 21 Stats. 422.
Pawnee, 1876, 19 Stats. 28.
Otoe and Missouria, 1882, 21 Stats. 380.
Tonkawa, formerly Nez Perce Reservation, 1884, 20 Stats. 63.
Sac and Fox, 1867, 15 Stats. 495.
Iowa Executive order, 1883, Kappler, Indian Laws and Treaties, Vol. I, 843.
Kickapoo, Executive order, 1883, ibid. 844.
Potawatomi, 1867, 15 Stats. 591.
Cheyenne-Arapaho, 1869, Executive order, Kappler, Vol. I, 839.
Comanche-Kiowa-Apache, 1867, 15 Stats. 581.
The Wichita and Caddo were given their reservation in 1872 by unratified agreement, but had been living there for a long time before; they themselves said for two centuries.

Through this dike, however, the range-cattle industry at last began to flow. An industry, more fluid in its nature than agriculture, at last began to trickle through a barrier that had proved impenetrable to white settlement in the ordinary sense of the term.

This was not true at first. As long as there was abundant range elsewhere, the cattlemen who occasionally drove herds up the trails leading across Oklahoma did not view the permanent occupation of that region with much favor. True, the range and climate were excellent. Lying between the breeding grounds of Texas and the feeding grounds of the northern plains, Oklahoma had most of the advantages of both and few of the disadvantages of either. The climate was mild enough to enable cattle to live through the winter upon the open range without serious loss, and yet cool and bracing enough so that the animals grew larger and became fatter than they did in the extreme Southwest. The water supply was fairly abundant and the pasturage of the best. Yet there were disadvantages, too. The ever hungry Indians would be certain to prove a constant source of anxiety and of loss, while the Department of the Interior refused to give leases of Indian land for grazing purposes and showed an earnest determination to keep the ranchmen out. Even if it were possible to occupy ranges there by stealth, or with the connivance of Indian agents and their employees, the ranchmen would be in a region entirely without the protection of the law, and so would have little redress when their herds were preyed upon by the barbaric tribes that occupied these reservations, or by white thieves and outlaws. In consequence it was some time before there was any real attempt at permanent occupation of pasture lands in Oklahoma by the ranchmen.

As this great stream of Texas cattle continued to flow north and spread itself over the plains, attractive ranges became increasingly scarce. Cattle companies were paying large dividends, as much as 25 to 35 per cent a year in some cases,[9] and such profits naturally caused the rapid extension of the industry. Beef contractors were permitted to bring herds into Oklahoma and hold them near the agencies for issue to the Indians; ranchmen living along the border in adjoining States permitted their cattle to drift across the line; others, driving herds on the trails across Oklahoma, began in some cases to linger for several weeks or months during the drive, and at last some of these men began to contemplate a permanent occupation of these rich pasture lands.

The first attempts met with little success. The Department of the Interior refused to approve leases or grazing permits, insisting that under the existing law it had no right to do so and called upon the

[9] L. A. Allen, Our Cattle Industry Past and Present, pp. 6-7.

War Department to expel all intruders.[10] The latter made a half-hearted attempt to do this, but soon desisted, claiming it was impossible, and urged the Department of the Interior to permit grazing upon the western reservations in consideration of a reasonable payment for that privilege.[11] The Department of the Interior refused, and the result was an unseemly altercation between the two departments.

In the meantime more and more cattle were brought upon the Indian reservations. Some of the Indian agents, finding themselves confronted with a shortage of food for their charges, owing to inadequate appropriations, sought to make up the deficiency by granting to the ranchmen permission to pasture cattle upon Indian lands in exchange for beef.[12]

In the spring of 1883, the agent for the Cheyenne-Arapaho, John D. Miles, called the Indians together in council and secured the consent of the greater part of them to lease nearly all their reservation to seven cattlemen for a period of 10 years at a yearly rental of two cents an acre. The total amount of land leased was over 3,000,000 acres, for which the Indians were to receive $62,000 a year.[13]

These leases were sent to Washington for approval by the Department of the Interior, accompanied by a letter from Agent Miles describing in glowing terms the benefits that were certain to accrue to the Indians.[14] This brought the matter of grazing cattle upon Indian lands to a direct issue, since the interests involved were of such magnitude as to demand attention. The result was that the Secretary of the Interior wrote to Mr. Edward Fenlon, one of the lessees, a letter known as the "Fenlon letter," laying down the policy which the department had determined to pursue. In this letter the Secretary said in part:

> While the department will not recognize the agreement or lease you mention, nor any other of like character, to the extent of approving the same, nor to the extent of assuming to settle controversies that may arise between the different parties holding such agreements, yet the department will endeavor to see that parties having no agreement are not allowed to interfere with those who have. Whenever there shall be just cause for dissatisfaction on the part of the Indians, or when it shall appear that improper persons, under the cover of such lease or agreement, are allowed in the Territory by parties holding such agreement, or for any reason the department shall consider it desirable for the public interest to do so, it will exercise its right of supervision to the extent of removing all occupants from the Territory without reference to such lease or agreement, on such notice as shall be right and proper under the circumstances under which the parties have entered the Territory and

[10] See Price to Lewis, Sen. Ex. Doc. 54, 48th Cong., 1st sess., Vol. IV, p. 54 (Oct. 20, 1881). Also Price to Sec. of Int. Jan. 28, 1882, ibid., p. 57, and Kirkwood to Sec. of War, Feb. 1 1882, ibid., p. 58.

[11] Sheridan to Lincoln, Mar. 6, 1882, ibid., p. 60.

[12] Report of Com. of Indian Affs., 1882, p. 68.

[13] See inclosure of Miles to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Apr. 6, 1883. Sen. Ex. Doc. 54, 48th Cong., 1st sess., Vol. IV, p. 92.

[14] Miles to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Apr. 6, 1883. Sen. Ex. Doc. 17, 48th Cong., 2d sess., Vol. I, p. 92.

have complied with the terms of the agreement and instructions of the department. All parties accepting such agreements should accept the same subject to all conditions herein, and subject to any future action of Congress and this department as herein stated in relation to occupants of such Territory. Instructions will be issued to the agents in accordance with this letter.[15]

Such a policy was little short of absurd. It invited ranchmen to enter the Indian Territory and intrigue with savage tribesmen. It placed a premium upon bribery and corruption and made of every agency employee a person to be flattered, cajoled, and, if possible, bribed by men with large interests at stake. Also, it could not be enforced. Men who had no agreements approved by the agent, but who were friendly with certain small bands of Indians, refused to remove, and their Indian friends, who were receiving more money from these ranchmen than their share of the lease money would amount to, refused to ratify the agreement made by their chiefs, and cut the fences and killed the cattle of the "approved lessees." The latter appealed to the agent for protection, demanding that men without leases be excluded; but the War Department, when called upon for troops, refused to furnish them on the ground that leases had not been approved by the Department of the Interior.[16]

Conditions on the Cheyenne-Arapaho reservation steadily grew worse. Agent Miles resigned and the new agent was unequal to the task imposed upon him. The Indians got beyond control, partly as a result of interference with them by rival groups of cattlemen, and a general outbreak was threatened.[17] The result was that General Sheridan was sent to this reservation with all available troops in the West to quiet the trouble, and the President at last ordered all cattle to be removed from the reservation within 40 days.[18] The number of cattle on the reservation was estimated at 210,000 head, but was possibly much larger. By December, 1885, all had been removed, but range was scarce elsewhere and the winter a severe one. As a result, the losses of cattle by starvation and freezing were frightful throughout the Southwest in this winter of 1885–6, and these losses were no doubt in part due to the placing of these Oklahoma cattle upon the already overstocked ranges of the bordering States.[19]

In the meantine the Cherokee Outlet was also the field of great ranching operations. That region had been given to the Cherokees, and a patent issued to them for it a few years after their removal; but in 1866 they had by treaty agreed to allow United States to

[15] Teller to Fenlon, Apr. 4, 1882. Sen. Ex. Doc. 54, 48th Cong., 1st sess., Vol. IV, p. 99.

[16] Augur to Adjutant General of the Army, Apr. 7, 1884. Sen. Ex. Doc. 17, 48th Cong., 2d sess., Vol. I, p. 97.

[17] Sen. Ex. Doc. 16, 48th Cong., 2d sess., Vol. I.

[18] Proclamation of July 23, 1885, 24 Stats. 1023. The ranchmen later asserted that Cleveland, by compelling immediate removal of herds from the Cheyenne-Arapaho reservation, struck the cattle interests of the United States a blow from which they never recovered.

[19] See Sheridan's report, July 21, 1885. House Ex. Doc. 1, 49th Cong., 1st sess., Vol. II, pt. II, pp. 69–70.

locate friendly Indians there, the title to remain with the Cherokees until such Indians had been so located. Under the terms of this treaty, several tribes had been placed in the Outlet, but the major portion of it, amounting to over 6,000,000 acres, remained unoccupied in the hands of the Cherokees. Trail herds crossing Oklahoma early formed the practice of lingering there, in some cases spending several months on these rich pasture lands. Ranchmen in Kansas also began to allow their cattle to cross the line into the Cherokee Outlet, and in some cases drove them into that region for the winter when grass was scarce on the Kansas side of the line.

In 1879 the Cherokees awoke to the possibilities of revenue that might be derived from the Outlet and sent a collector there to levy a grazing tax on all cattle.[20] By this time a large portion of the region had been occupied by ranchmen with their herds. Some of these cattlemen held ranges under the cover of the names of Cherokee citizens who had taken up claims under a sort of assumed headright. Others were occupying pasture lands without any shadow of right, the various individuals determining among themselves the boundaries of each man's range under what was known as "cow custom."[21]

Most of these men paid cheerfully the grazing tax of 40 cents a head per year levied by the Cherokees, but a few evaded this payment, so that it was impossible to collect for a large number of the cattle on the Outlet. Men living in Kansas near the border would drive their cattle across the line into the Cherokee Outlet to avoid paying the property tax on them in Kansas and then drive them back into Kansas in order to avoid paying the grazing tax to the Cherokee.

In order to protect themselves and their ranges against these unscrupulous individuals, and also to aid in determining the rights of each man, the ranchmen who were regularly paying the Cherokee for grazing privileges formed, in 1880, a tentative association. The organization was a very loose one and was merely designed to fix the dates and places of round-ups, to provide some method of settling disputes, to take some measures for protection against trespassers, and also to design plans to combat fires, wolves, thieves, and other destructive agencies.[22]

As more and more cattle were brought into the Outlet, fences were erected about many ranges as a convenience in holding the animals. Also, the Cherokees became more efficient in collecting the grazing tax. The treasurer of the Cherokee Nation came each year to Caldwell, Kans., and established an office there for the collection of this money,

[20] Testimony of Ben S. Miller before the Senate investigating committee, Jan. 9, 1885. Sen. Rep. 1278, 49th Cong., 1st sess., Vol. VIII, pp. 79–80.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Testimony of John A. Blair before the Senate investigating committee Jan. 21, 1885. Sen. Rep. 1278, 49th Cong., 1st sess., Vol. VIII, p 180.

but in spite of his best efforts it was impossible to get all that was rightfully due.[23]

In the meantime the fame of the Cherokee Outlet as a desirable field for ranching had spread to such an extent that the Department of the Interior began to receive numerous inquiries relative to the matter of securing grazing privileges in that territory. Replies to some of these referred the inquirers to the Cherokee authorities, with the explanation that the lands in question were in the possession and under the jurisdiction of the Cherokee Nation of Indians, and sometimes added the information that these Indians granted permits for grazing cattle there.[24] However, to inquiries as to whether or not the Interior Department would permit a lease to be negotiated with these Indians for a term of years and would recognize it and protect the lessees, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs returned a reply in the negative.[25]

It was evident that the tenure of these men occupying the Outlet with herds of cattle was very precarious, and late in 1882 their operations were reported to the Department of the Interior, and an order was issued requiring them to remove all fences and other improvements from these lands within 20 days, failing which they would be removed by the military.[26] Fortunately for the ranchmen, the War Department again showed the utmost reluctance to carry out the request of the Department of the Interior. In the meantime, such a storm of protest was aroused that the order was held in suspension and the cattlemen were allowed to try to make some arrangement with the Cherokee authorities for a more permanent occupation of the Outlet.[27]

This they did in the spring of 1883, by forming an organization known as the Cherokee Strip Live Stock Association, and obtaining from the Cherokee National Council a lease of the Outlet for a term of five years at a rental of $100,000 a year.[28]

The association thus formed was perhaps the largest organization in the world for the promotion of the livestock industry. It was chartered under the laws of Kansas, and embraced more than a hundred individuals and firms. Its members held at this time some 300,000 head of cattle upon the Cherokee Outlet and enormous numbers elsewhere. Its surveyors set to work to determine the boundaries of each member's range, and its court of arbitration

---

[23] The amounts collected each year were as follows: 1879, $1,100; 1880, $7,620; 1881, $21,555.54; 1882, $41,233.81. See Cherokee Advocate, Feb. 6, 1885.

[24] Acting Commissioner Stevens to Alvord and Woodruff, May 6, 1881. Sen. Ex. Doc. 54, 48th Cong., 1st sess., Vol. IV, p. 128. Also, Stevens to Holt, May 20, 1882. Ibid., p. 10.

[25] Price to Strong, Oct. 11, 1881. Ibid., p. 128.

[26] Price to Tufts, Dec. 30, 1882. Ibid., p. 130.

[27] Teller to Price, Mar. 16, 1883. Ibid., p. 150.

[28] Sen. Ex. Doc. 17, 48th Cong. 2d sess. Vol. I, pp. 151–152.

heard and settled questions involving tens of thousands of dollars.[29] Its power and influence were of the greatest. Some of its members drove their herds into the region known as "Old Oklahoma," others occupied some of the reservations to the south. The cattlemen who had been removed from the Cheyenne and Arapaho country gradually came drifting back again, and men belonging to the Cherokee Strip Live Stock Association also took herds into that region. Other associations were formed but not on so large a scale.

These associations were unique. The ranchmen were without any adequate protection of law and in consequence formed these extra legal organizations, not with the object of securing liberty under ideals of individualism as was the case with most earlier frontier organizations, but to protect property—their herds of cattle. Thus they were economic, rather than political, in their nature, and foreshadowed the later associational arrangements of "big business" that sought to act as corporate persons in accordance with frontier ideals.

For more than six years the Cherokee Strip Live Stock Association was a great power in the Southwest. It fenced the remaining lands of the Outlet, improved the breed of cattle, provided better shipping facilities at the various "cow towns," sought diligently to protect the property of its members against thieves, fire, wolves, and disease, and all the while carried on a bitter struggle against a multitude of opposing elements that sought to destroy it. In this struggle the association always proved the victor until it was at last forced to yield to the power of no less an antagonist than the United States Government itself.

Even then it was not through any fault or mismanagement on the part of its directors and members that the association was driven out of this region. It was merely the victim in a struggle between the United States Government and the Cherokees in which the former sought to induce the latter to cede the lands of the Outlet to furnish homes for white settlers. The great corporation which had for years withstood the attacks of many bitter enemies was at last caught and crushed between these two powerful opposing forces. It was the more or less "innocent bystander," or perhaps it would be more correct to say it was the source of food supply of one of the opponents which must be destroyed in order to force the enemy to surrender.

At the expiration of the five-year term for which the Cherokee Outlet had been leased, the association obtained from the Cherokees a new lease for a second period of five years, paying this time the sum of $200,000 a year.[30] But the Government of the United States had

[29] Lyons to Eldred, July 21, 1883, Aug. 26, 1883, and Sept. 26, 1883. Chas. Eldred Papers.
[30] Lyons to Eldred, Dec. 8, 1888. Chas. Eldred Papers.

determined to secure a cession of these lands from the Cherokees in order that they might be opened to white settlement, and now, through the Cherokee Commission, appointed for that purpose, offered the Indians $1.25 an acre for all the lands of the Outlet. Since they had already been offered $3 an acre, or a total sum of $18,000,000, for the Outlet, by a cattle syndicate, provided they could get the consent of the United States to sell,[31] the Cherokees naturally refused the offer of the Government and persisted in this refusal in spite of repeated pleadings and bullyings.

Accordingly, after obtaining from the Attorney General an opinion that the Outlet leases had no legal force or validity, President Harrison, about the middle of February, 1890, issued a proclamation forbidding grazing on the lands of the Cherokee Outlet as prejudicial to the public interests, and ordering all cattle to be removed by October 1, 1890, or sooner, if the lands were in the meantime opened to settlement.[32]

The Indians here met with the same attitude on the part of the Government of the United States that they had met in Georgia more than half a century before. Their lands were needed for white settlement, and yet they refused to cede their equity for what the United States officials regarded as a fair price. As a result, and in order to compel this cession, it was decided that they must be deprived of all revenue or benefit from these lands until such time as they were willing to yield.

The removal of the ranchmen from the Outlet and the opening of the latter to white settlement was inevitable sooner or later. But the removal of the cattlemen at just this time was a political rather than an economic step, though the ultimate purpose of the Government was a great economic change in this region through the opening of this land to agricultural settlement. Since this settlement did not take place for more than three and a half years after the issuance of the President's proclamation, and not until almost three years after the ranchmen had been forced out, the conclusion follows that the ranchmen were not removed in order to make room for settlers, but to stop the revenue derived from these lands by the Cherokees, and so induce the Indians to cede this area upon the terms offered. This cession they were at last forced to make, though the price paid was a little more than was at first offered, amounting to about $1.40 an acre.[33]

---

[31] See 25 Stats. 1005, and Sen. Misc. Doc. 80, 50th Cong., 2d sess., p. 20.

[32] See Opinion of Attorney General Miller, 19 Opinions, 499, and 26 Stats. 1557. This opinion of Attorney General Miller merely reaffirmed that of Attorney General Garland given July 21, 1885. See 18 Opinions, 235.

[33] See agreement in Sen. Ex. Doc. 56, 52 Cong., 2d sess., Vol. V, pp. 15-16.

The replacing of the ranchmen on the Cherokee Outlet with an agricultural population was but one chapter in the story of the struggle between the cattlemen of Oklahoma and the pioneer farmers of adjoining States. It was a struggle which had begun almost as soon as cattle had been brought into that territory and was to continue practically without intermission until the herds had been forced out and the entire region given over to farming.

As agricultural settlement advanced steadily westward on either side of Oklahoma and good farming lands became increasingly scarce, the pioneer farmers began to look with longing eyes toward the great reservations of the Indian Territory. The presence there of many ranchmen, while they themselves were excluded, aroused the bitter resentment of the pioneer farmers, who at last began to make determined efforts to secure the opening of these lands to settlement. Naturally these efforts were resisted by the cattlemen, and the hostility of the would-be settlers was greatly increased by this resistance. The ranchmen came to be regarded as wealthy monopolists, and it was alleged that they bribed the United States officials, corrupted the Indians, and intimidated those who sought to oppose them.[34]

Not only did the settlers along the border seek to secure the opening of these lands by act of Congress, but failing in this, they made determined efforts to settle some of them in defiance of law, and when they were removed by the military many of them insisted that the action of the United States Government had been taken at the instigation of the cattlemen. Little newspapers grew up near the border, established apparently for the twofold purpose of "booming" the opening of Oklahoma lands to settlement and of abusing the cattlemen. The press throughout the country took the matter up; the question of opening Oklahoma to settlement found its way into politics, and office seekers, both local and national, with an eye upon the farmer vote, urged it vigorously, and added their voices to the general outcry against the ranchmen. That the occupation of the country by agricultural settlement was inevitable sooner or later must have been obvious to all. The important thing about the whole matter is that the ranchmen in this way received much unfavorable advertising. They were so critcized and abused by these would-be settlers and their sympathizers that along with public opinion favorable to opening the Indian lands to settlement there also grew up, in the same proportion, a public opinion bitterly adverse to the cattlemen. This was especially true because added to this clamor was that of the homesteaders in other Western States and Territories who urged that the ranchmen monopolized the public domain and sought to prevent settlement.

[34] Jackson and Cole, Oklahoma, pp. 134–135.

Out of all this there grew up and crystallized a public opinion that has never changed—to the effect that the cattlemen of our western plains were in a great measure selfish, brutal, and domineering, using their great wealth and the power derived from organization to oppress.

It is false in a great measure, but the opinion still persists, because the ranching industry largely disappeared before it had time to live down the charges thus preferred against it. In consequence, there is a widespread popular belief that the cattlemen were among the first "malefactors of great wealth" of the nineteenth century. From these accusations it was but a step to accusations against railways, manufacturers and others, so it may be confidently asserted that the strong public sentiment against combinations of capital and unscrupulous individuals of great wealth which characterized the "Populistic Southwest" was in part due in its origin to this struggle over Oklahoma between the ranchmen and pioneer settlers.

It was a losing struggle for the cattle interests, however, and in time the dike placed about Oklahoma by governmental decree gave way and settlement came pouring through. Even then the replacing of ranching by agriculture in Oklahoma was most peculiar and has no counterpart in any other State. The settling of most Western States by an agriculture population has been like the slow, steady leaking of water into the hold of an old-type ship until it was full That of Oklahoma was like the sudden bursting of water into the hold of a modern vessel divided into many water-tight compartments. The first region to be opened to settlement in the Indian country was "Old Oklahoma" which was opened in 1889, and almost each succeeding year for the next decade saw one or more areas added to the original nucleus. The Panhandle was added to Oklahoma in 1890 by the organic act; the Sac and Fox, Potawatomi, and Iowa Reservations were opened in 1891; the Cheyenne-Arapaho Reservation in 1892; the Cherokee Outlet in 1893, and various others, one by one until the last one, the "Big Pasture," was settled in 1906.

Long before the last one was settled, the Department of the Interior had adopted a system of leasing Indian lands for grazing purposes, and so as each Indian reservation was opened and settled, in most cases almost in a single day, the ranchmen withdrew their herds into those remaining until with the opening of the last they found there were no longer any pasture lands left to them.

It should be noted that opening these lands to white settlement did not constitute taking the land from the Indian and giving it to the settler. The Indian did not use the land. As an economic factor he was negligible. What really happened was the taking of the land from the ranchmen and the giving it over to agriculture.

But few better examples can be found in our history of the complete change in the economic life of large regions through legislation.

It should be observed, too, that the peculiar method of settling Oklahoma proved disastrous to many ranchmen. Large areas were settled in a single day; no time was given for adjustment; crowds of settlers, swarming across lands not yet open to settlement in order to reach others that were, burned the grass, cut the fences, and brought disease to the cattle. Changes came with startling rapidity. The cattlemen unable to adapt themselves to these conditions suffered heavy financial losses, with the result that as the industry passed out many of them found themselves entirely ruined.

Even after some of the reservations were settled, the cattle industry lingered on, in some cases for a year or two, but here it mingles with another story—that of ranching upon the public domain. However there was little of this, and generally speaking the coming of agricultural settlement marked the passing of the ranch cattle industry in Oklahoma.

INDEX

Compiled by H. S. Parsons, Library of Congress

Abbott, Wilbur C., of writing of hist. spec. com. (1921), 23, 51, 105.
Abel, Annie H., of hist. mss. comm. (1921), 20, 104.
Abilene, Kans., cattle drives to, 311.
Accomack, 213.
Activities, A. H. A. advisory com. on, 72.
Activities of the American Historical Association, 1884–1920, Leland, 73–82.
Adams, Charles F., *Three Episodes of New England History*, 151.
Adams, Charles K., *Manual of Hist. Lit.*, 51, 69, 77, 95.
Adams, George B., life councilor, A. H. A., 13, 19.
Adams, James T., *Hist. of the Town of Southampton (N. Y.)*, 151.
Adams, John, receipt for making a New England town, 246.
Adjutant General. *See* U. S. Adjutant General.
Agenda, A. H. A. com. (1921), 19, 107; name adopted, 104; established, 107.
AGRARIAN DISCONTENT IN THE SOUTH, 1880–1900, Kendrick, 48–49, 265–272.
Agricultural Fair, Influence upon American Society, 1830–1851, Kellar, 47.
Agricultural History Society, joint session with A. H. A. (1920), 34, 47–48; policy com. recommendations, 71; activities, 73.
Agricultural Revolution in New England, 1815–1860, Bidwell, 47.
AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, EARLY DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES, True, 293–306.
AGRICULTURE AS A FIELD FOR HISTORICAL RESEARCH (abstract), Schmidt, 161–162.
AGRICULTURE IN PENNSYLVANIA, DESCRIPTION AND TRAVEL AS SOURCE MATERIAL FOR THE HISTORY OF, Kelsey, 283–292.
Alabama, Dept. of Archives and Hist., calendaring French archives, 133; war records collection, 136, 142.
Alains, 169.
Alaska, U. S. policy with regard to, 123.
Allied Powers, favored free Poland, 204.
Allison, William H., of bibliog. com. (1921), 22.
Amalgamated Clothing Workers, 159, 160.
American Audit Co., audit of A. H. A. treas. accts., 56, 63–65.
American Background of Federalism, Hockett, 46.
American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, 120.
American Catholic Historical Association, joint session with A. H. A. (1920), 34.
American Classical League, com. on Latin as internatl. language, 186.
American Council of Learned Societies, A. H. A. affiliated with, 60; A. H. A. policy com. recommendations, 71–72, 103; activities, 74.
American Historical Association, act of incorporation, 5; constitution, 11; by-laws, 12; officers elected for 1921, 13–14, 52; terms of office, 16–18; officers and committees (1921), 19–23, 104–105; organization and activities, 24–25; historical prizes, 27–28; membership, 29–30, 49, 59; amdt. to constitution and by-laws, 52, 56, 57, 58, 99, 102; deaths (1920), 60; recommendations as to ann. rept., 67–68; activities (1884–1920), 73–82; account of ann. rept. 75. *See also* Annual report.—Budget.—Finances.
American Historical Review, board of editors (1921), 20, 107; cost of printing, 50; report of treas. (1920), 62–63; report of Am. Audit Co. on finances (1920), 65; policy com. recommendations, 71, 72; report of editors (1920), 82–83.
American Jewish Committee, war records, 145.
American Library Association, A. H. A. cooperation in comp. manual of hist. lit., 69, 94, 95, 103.
American manufactures, resulting from embargo, 258–259, 260.
American Philosophical Society, 299, 302.
American Political Science Association, joint session with A. H. A. (1920), 34, 49.
American Red Cross. *See* Red Cross.
American Society of Church History, activities, 73.
American Sociological Society, joint session with A. H. A. (1920), 34.
American travels, bibliog., 77, 103.
American University Union, 74, 100.
American Year Book, 82.
Ames, Herman V., of audit com. (1920), 56; report of audit com. (1920), 56, 65; prize awarded to (1896), 80.
Ampère, André, experiments in electromagnetism, 275–276.
Anatomy, 176.
Anderson, Frank M., of military hist. prize spec. com. (1918–1920), 89.
Andrew D. White fund, policy com. recommendations, 72; origin, 74.
Andrews, Charles M., of com. on obtaining transcripts from foreign archives (1921), 22, 104.
Anne, Queen, English Political Parties and Leaders in the Reign of, Morgan, 84.

Annual meeting of A. H. A., program com. (1921), 20, 104; local com. (1921), 20; PROCEEDINGS (1920), 31-111; place of meeting (1920), 33, (1921), 51, 57, 66, 102; program (1920), 53-55; policy com. (1920), recommendations, 67, 102-103; places, 74; attendance (1920), 108-111.
Appointments, A. H. A. com. (1921), 19, 108.
Architecture in the History of the Colonies and of the Republic, Kimball, 46.
Archives. *See* Obtaining transcripts from foreign archives, A. H. A. com.
Archives of Hawaii, Lydecker, 121.
Aretæus, 175.
Ashley, R. L., discussion on education for citizenship in the schools, 125-126.
Ashley, W. J., economic hist. prof. at Harvard, 155.
Aspirations of One Small State, Putnam, 43.
Association of Collegiate Alumnæ, Nat. club house com., reception, 35; vote of thanks to, 107.
Audit committee of A. H. A. (1920) appointed, 56; report, 56, 65.
Austin, Stephen F., papers, 83.
Austria, enlightened despotism in, 196, 197.
Avars, 170.
Baldwin, Simeon E., life councilor, A. H. A., 13, 19.
Baltimore, Md., war records collection, 137; effect of embargo, 253.
Barker, Eugene C., of hist. mss. comm. (1921), 20, 104; *Austin papers*, 83; conf. of hist. socs, com. on coop. of hist. socs. and depts., report (1920), 132-134.
Bartram, John, method of fertilizing, 287.
Bassett, John S., sec. A. H. A. (1921), 13, 19, 52, 57; of agenda com. (1921), 19, 107; chairman meetings and relations com. (1921), 19, 108; of finance com. (1921), 19, 108; of appointments com. (1921), 19, 108; of publications com. (1921), 21, 104; chairman com. to cooperate with Peoples of Am. Soc. (1921), 23, 108; report as sec. (1920), 59-60; at meeting of policy com., 67; at meeting of membership com., 84, 85; present at council meetings, 100, 102, 103, 105, 107.
Bath and West of England Society, 296.
Baxter, Richard, *Christian Directory*, 228.
Bay State Historical League, work, 38; formed, 151.
Beauregard, Nettie H., of local arrangements com. (1921), 20, 108.
Becker, Carl, of board of editors, *Am. Hist. Rev.* (1921), 20, 52; declines nomination for executive council, 57; report of policy com. (1920), 67-73.
Beer, George L., memorial, 57, 58, 59, 101; bequest for European hist. prize, 101. *See also* George L. Beer prize.
Belaunde, Victor A., *Communistic System of the Incas*, 44.
Belote, Theodore, address, 36.
Benton, Elbert J., of service com. (1921), 22, 108.
Berger, Jacob, used gypsum for fertilizer, 288.
Berlin, Decree 253.
Bibliography, A. H. A. com. (1921), 22, 104; policy com. recommendations, 69, 103; activities, 77.
Bibliography of American travel, A. H. A. subcom. (1921), 22, 108.
Bibliography of American Travels, 77.
Bibliography of Historical Societies, Griffin, 77.
Bibliography of historical socieites, conf. of hist. socs. com. on (1921), 21, 38, 132.
Bibliography of modern English history, A. H. A. spec. com. (1921), 22, 105; efforts toward, 69, 77-78, 103; report (1920), 88.
Bibliography of the Printed Archives of the Original States, 76.
Biddle, Nicholas, effect of embargo in Philadelphia, 261.
Bidwell, Percy W., *Agricultural Revolution in New England, 1815-1860*, 47.
Bieber, Ralph P., of local arrangements com. (1921), 20, 108.
Biggar, H. P., treas. London branch, 100.
Binney, Horace, effect of embargo, 257.
Bixby, William K., chairman of local arrangements com. (1921), 20, 108.
Bliss, W. F., of ex. com. P. C. B. (1921), 15, 122; presided at P. C. B. meeting (1920), 115; *Social Sciences and Education for Citizenship in the Schools*, 124.
Boardman, Mabel, address, 34.
Bolton, Herbert E., present at council meeting, 102, 103, 105; presided at P. C. B. dinner (1920), 115.
Bonham, Milledge L., *jr.*, of membership com. (1921), 21, 108; of military hist. prize spec. com. (1913-1920), 89, chairman (1918-1920), 89; final report military hist. prize spec. com. (1920), 89-90.
Bordley, John B., chairman com. of Phila. Soc. for Promotion of Agric., 299.
Boucher, Chauncey S., pres. Miss. Valley Hist. Assoc., 34.
Bourne, Henry E., of nominations com. (1921), 20, 52, 57; of membership com. (1921), 21, 108; of hist. teaching in the schools com. (1921), 22, 108; present at council meeting, 100, 102, 103, 107; present at conf. on report of hist. and educa. for citizenship in the schools com., 107.
Boyd, Allen R., letter transmitting ann. rept., 7; editor, A. H. A. (1921), 19; of publications com. (1921), 21, 104; of military hist. com. (1921), 22, 104; editor's report (1920), 83-84; of military hist. prize spec. com. (1913-1920), 89; present at council meeting, 100, 102, 103, 105, 107; report of military hist. prize com. (1920), 105.
Bradford, *Gov.*, *History of Plymouth Plantation*, 215-216.
Braintree, Mass., resolutions on stamp act, 247.
Break-up of the Hapsburg Empire, Coolidge, 43.
Bretz, Julian P., of membership com. (1921), 21, 108.
Brewery, Flour, Cereal, and Soft Drink Workers, 159.
Brief Statement of the Opportunities for Historical Research in Hawaii, Leebrick, 119-121.
Brigham, Clarence S., of service com. (1921), 22, 108.
British Association for the Advancement of Science, com. to study pract. of internatl. language, 186.
British Classical Association, com. on internatl. language, 186.
Brookings, Robert S., chairman local com. (1921), 107.
Brooks, Robert P., of hist. mss. comm. (1921), 20, 104; of membership com. (1921), 21, 108.
Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, 159.
Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 159.
Brown, Louise F., of membership com. (1921), 21, 104, (1920), 84.

Brown, Marshall S., of com. to formulate rules for Geo. L. Beer prize (1921), 20, 105.
Bubonic plague, 177.
Buck, Solon J., of conf. of hist. socs. com. on hndbk. of hist. socs. (1921), 21, 132; of bibliog. of Am. travel subcom. (1921), 22, 108; of public archives comm. (1921), 22, 104.
Buckwheat, Cazenove journal, 290.
Budget of A. H. A. (1921), 56, 105-106.
Buffalo, N. Y., appropriation for war records, 136, 137.
Bureau of Navigation. *See* U. S. Bureau of Navigation.
Burr, George L., life councilor, A. H. A., 14, 19; present at council meetings, 100, 102, 103, 105, 107.
Burton, Clarence M.. subscription for calendaring French archives, 133.
Butler, Samuel, ridiculed New England towns, 246-247.
Byrne, Eugene H., of membership com. (1921), 21, 104, (1920), 84.
Calendar of printed letters rel. to Am. hist., A. H. A. com. (1908), 81.
California, war records collection, 136, 138, 140; newspapers, 144; war history, 145.
Callahan, James M., of audit com. (1920), 56; report of audit com. (1920), 56, 65.
Calm Address to Our American Colonies, Wesley, 46.
CAPITALISTIC AND SOCIALISTIC TENDENCIES IN THE PURITAN COLONIES, Day, 44-45, 223-235.
Carlton, Frank T., address, 36; FIELDS OF RESEARCH IN ECONOMIC HISTORY, 159-161.
Carnegie Institution, Dept. of Hist. Research to publish calendar of Parisian archives rel. to Miss. Valley, 38, 133; Dept. of Hist. Research established, 81.
Caroline minuscule, 183.
Cattle, HIST. OF INDUSTRY IN OKLA., 307-322.
Cazenove, Theophile, *Journal, 1794*, 290-292.
Celsus, 175.
Central Powers, joint manifesto rel. to independent Poland, 203.
Champlain, Samuel de, account of Plymouth, 213.
Chandler, Charles L., of hist. congress at Rio de Janeiro spec. com. (1921), 23, 105.
Channing, Edward, life councilor, A. H. A., 14, 19; of meetings and relations com. (1921), 19, 108; pres. A. H. A. (1920), 34; *Historical Retrospect*, 35; presides at annual meeting, 56; presides at council meeting, 100, 102, 103, 105.
Chase, Philip P., of hist. teaching in the schools com. (1921), 22, 108.
Cherokee Indians, cattle grazing on lands of, 316-319.
Cherokee Outlet, cattle raising, 315-320; opened to settlement, 321.
Cherokee Strip Live Stock Association, 317-318.
Chester County, Pa., Hessian fly, 290.
Cheyenne-Arapaho Reservation, land leases 314-315; opened to settlement, 321.
Cheyney, Edward P., 2d vice pres. A. H. A. (1921), 13, 19, 52, 57; of agenda com. (1921), 19, 107; of appointments com. (1921), 19, 108; chairman bibliog. of modern English hist. spec. com. (1921), 22,105; report of editors of *Am. Hist. Rev.* (1920), 82-83; report bibliog. of mod. Engl. hist. spec. com. (1920), 88; present at council meeting, 107.
Chicago Historical Society, calendaring French archives, 133.
Christian Directory, Baxter, 228.
Clark, A. Howard, bibliog. of members of A. H. A., 77.
Clark, Robert C., pres. P. C. B. (1921), 15, 121.
Clelland, R. G., presided at P. C. B. meeting (1920), 115; chairman P. C. B. auditing com. (1920), 121.
Clemen, Rudolf A., *Economic Bases of the American System of Large-Scale Meat Packing*, 47-48.
Coast Guard. *See* U. S. Coast Guard.
Coke of Holkham, 300.
Colby, Charles W., of writing of hist. spec. com. (1921), 23, 51, 105.
Colding, Ludwig A., work in electromagnetism, 277.
Cole, *Dr.*, Huntington Library collection of Am. hist., 119.
Collection of State War Records, Holbrook, 135.
College of Hawaii. *See* Hawaii, University of.
Colman, Benjamin, election sermon, 232.
Colonial Civil Service, Lowell, 82.
Colonial entries in *Privy-Council Register*, 81.
Commission on Training Camp Activities, war records, 141.
Committee on Public Information. *See* U. S. Committee on Public Information.
Commons, *Prof.*, *Hist. of Labor in the U. S.*, 161.
Communistic System of the Incas, Belaunde, 44.
Compleat Body of Divinity, Willard, 230.
Confederate Government, Control of Manufacturing by the, Ramsdell, 48.
Conference of historical societies, members (1921), 21, 104; annual meeting (1920), 37-38; policy com. recommendations, 70; account of, 79; report (1920), 85-88; PROCEEDINGS (1920), 129-252.
Conference on economic history, papers (1920), 153-162.
Conger, A. L., editor *Military Historian and Economist*, 80; chairman military hist. prize spec. com. (1913-1916), 89.
Connecticut, war records collection, 136.
Connor, L. G., agricultural hist. proposal, 67, 71.
Connor, R. D. W., of public archives comm. (1921), 22, 104.
Contribution of Political Science to Education, Hunt, 122-123.
Control of Manufacturing by the Confederate Government, Ramsdell, 48.
Coolidge, Archibald C., of board of editors, *Am. Hist. Rev.* (1921), 20, 52, 107; *Break-up of the Hapsburg Empire*, 43.
Cooperation of historical societies and departments, conf. of hist. socs. com. on, report (1920), 132-134.
Coordination of Historical Societies within the States, Schafer, 131, 150.
Coppin, *Mr.*, pilot to Pilgrims, 220.
Corwin, Edward S., of com. to formulate rules for Geo. L. Beer prize (1921), 20, 105.
Council of National Defense. *See* U. S. Council of National Defense.
Cox, Isaac J., of Justin Winsor prize com. (1921), 20, 104.
Crammer, C. R., report of Am. Audit Co. on A. H. A. finances, 63-65.
Crofts, F. S., of Harper & Bros., 94.
Cross, Arthur L., councilor, A. H. A. (1921), 14, 19, 52, 57; of agenda com. (1921), 19, 107; of bibliog. of modern English hist. spec. com. (1921), 22,105; present at council meeting, 107.

Cunningham, Charles H., of hist. congress at Rio de Janeiro spec. com. (1921), 23, 105.
Cushman, Robert, *Sin and Danger of Self-Love*, 229.
Custis, George W. P., annual sheep shearings, 300.
Cutler, Timothy, *Firm Union of a People*, 232.
Dale, Edward E., HISTORY OF THE RANCH CATTLE INDUSTRY IN OKLAHOMA, 307-322.
Dalzell, William, white lead, 259.
Daszynski, Ignace, 203, 205.
Dawson, Edgar, of board of editors, *Hist. Outlook* (1921), 22, 105; proposed programs, 124-125.
Day, Clive, chairman Justin Winsor prize com. (1921). 20, 104; address, 35; CAPITALISTIC AND SOCIALISTIC TENDENCIES IN THE PURITAN COLONIES, 44-45, 223-235; RECOGNITION OF ECONOMIC HISTORY AS A DISTINCT SUBJECT, 155-156.
Deerfield, Mass., Indian massacre, 244.
Delaware, war records collection, 146.
Department of Agriculture. *See* U. S. Dept. of Agriculture.
Dermer, *Captain*, and settlement of Plymouth, 45; brings Tisquantum back to England, 215; explores Mass. coast, 215, 216, 217, 219.
DESCRIPTION AND TRAVEL AS SOURCE MATERIAL FOR THE HISTORY OF EARLY AGRICULTURE IN PENNSYLVANIA, Kelsey, 283-292.
DEVELOPMENT OF ELECTROMAGNETISM DURING THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS, Kennelly, 40, 273-281.
Dictionary of American Biography, policy com. recommendations, 72.
Dindley, Harlow, discussion of federation of hist. socs., 85.
Dioscorides, 175.
Disposition of records, A. H. A. com. on (1921), 20; report (1920), 102.
District of Columbia, agricultural exhibition, 1810, 301.
Dmowski, chairman of Polish Natl. Com., 201, 205.
DNIEPER, ORIGIN OF THE RUSSIAN STATE ON THE, Rostovtsev, 41-42, 163-171.
Docket, A. H. A. com., name changed to agenda com., 104.
Doctrinale, Villa Dei, 185.
Documentary historical publications of the U. S., A. H. A. spec. com. (1921), 22, 105; policy com. recommendations, 69, 103.
Documentary hist. of States, 81-82.
Documents relative to Illinois and the War, 148.
Dodd, William E., of nominations com. (1921), 20, 52, 57; report of policy com. (1920), 67-73.
Dodge City, Kan., cattle drives to, 311.
Dole, S. B., former President of Hawaii, 121.
Dole, Sara L., of ex. com. P. C. B. (1921), 15, 122.
Donatus, 185.
Donnan, Elizabeth, *Slave Trade into South Carolina before the Revolution*, 45.
Dornelly, Ignatius, political career, 48.
Dramm, Stella M., of local arrangements com. (1921), 20, 108.
Du Cange, *Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimæ Latinitatis*, 181.
Ducher, E. J. A., 84, 102.
Dues, A. H. A., increase, 50, 56, 72-73.
Duggan, Stephen P., *Syria, Palestine, and Mandates*, 44.
Dunning, William A., life councilor, A. H. A., 14, 19; chairman com. to formulate rules for Geo. L. Beer prize (1921), 20, 105.
Dutcher, George M., chairman bibliog. com. (1921), 22, 104; ENLIGHTENED DESPOTISM, 43, 187-198; chairman manual of hist. lit. spec. com. (1920), 51; report manual of hist. lit. spec. com. (1920), 94-99; present at council meeting, 102.
Dwight, Timothy, *Theology, Explained and Defended in a Series of Sermons*, 231.
Dynes, Sarah A., of membership com. (1921), 21, 108; of board of editors, *Hist. Outlook* (1921), 22, 105.
EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES IN THE UNITED STATES. True, 293-306.
Economic Bases of the American System of Large-Scale Meat Packing, Clemen, 47-48.
Economic history. *See* Conference on economic history.
Economics, importance in training and teaching of history, 123.
Edinburgh Society of Improvers in the Knowledge of Agriculture in Scotland, 295.
Electric Telegraph Company, 277.
ELECTROMAGNETISM, DEVELOPMENT OF, DURING LAST HUNDRED YEARS, Kennelly, 40, 273-281
Elegantiæ Linguæ Latinæ, Valla, 185.
Eliot, Jared, drill plow, 301.
Ellery, Eloise, of nominations com. (1921), 20, 52, 57, 99.
EMBARGO OF 1808, Sears, 47, 251-263.
Endowment, A. H. A. com. on (1921), established, 107.
England, supremacy of the state, 189-190, 191.
English history, bibliog. of modern, 69, 77-78, 103.
English Political Parties and Leaders in the Reign of Queen Anne, Morgan, 84.
ENLIGHTENED DESPOTISM, Dutcher, 42, 187-198.
Esarey, Logan, of hist. mss. comm. (1921), 20, 104.
Essex, *Earl* of, friend of Gorges, 212.
ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW POLAND, Holt, 43-44, 199-208.
European historical societies, A. H. A. com. (1910), 80.
European history, reprints considered, 81.
Evans, Austin P., of membership com. (1921), 21, 108; *Problem of Control in Medieval Industry*, 42.
Executive council of A. H. A., members (1921), 13-14, 19; report (1920), 65-67; minutes of meetings (1920), 100-107; proceedings adopted by correspondence (1920), 107-108.
Faraday, discovery of electromagnetic induction, 276.
Farm wages, in early Pa., 288-289.
Farmers' Alliance, 272.
Farrar, Victor, *United States Policy with Regard to Alaska*, 123.
Fay, Sidney B., councilor, A. H. A. (1921), 14, 19, 52, 57; of agenda com. (1921), 19, 107; of finance com. (1921), 19, 108; of bibliog. com. (1921), 22, 104; proposed manual of hist. lit., 95-97; present at council meeting, 107.
Federalism, American Background of, Hockett, 46.
Federation of Historical Societies of the Genesee Country, 152.
Fenlon, Edward, lessee of Indian lands, 314-315.

FIELD FOR THE TEACHING OF ECONOMIC HISTORY IN COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS, Usher, 156–159.
FIELDS OF RESEARCH IN ECONOMIC HISTORY, Carlton, 159–161.
Finance, A. H. A. com. (1921), 19, 108; report on budget (1921), 105–106.
Finances, A. H. A., report of treas. (1920), 49–50, 61–65; report of audit com. (1920), 56, 65; estimates (1921), 56; report of Am. Audit Co., 56, 63–65; policy com. recommendations, 72–73, 102; sales of A. H. A. publications, 84.
Firm Union of a People, Cutler, 232.
Fish, Carl R., councilor, A. H. A. (1921), 14, 19, 52, 57; of meetings and relations com. (1921), 19, 108; of appointments com. (1921), 19, 108; of nominations com. (1920), 99.
Five Civilized Tribes, cattle industry, 312, 314.
Fleming, Walter L., of program com. (1921), 20, 104.
Fling, Fred M., of military hist. prize spec. com. (1913–1920), 89.
Food Administration. *See* U. S. Food Administration.
Ford, Guy S., chairman board of editors, *Am. Hist. Rev.* (1921), 20, 52, 105; of hist. teaching in the schools com. (1921), 22, 108; report of policy com. (1920), 67–73.
Ford, Paul L., bibliogs. of members of A. H. A, 77.
Ford, Worthington C., life councilor, A. H. A., 14, 19; of service com. (1921), 22, 108; Bay State Historical League, 38; of Mass. Hist. Soc., 85; investigation of Hawaiian archives, 120; discussion, 131, 150; conf. of hist. socs. com. on coop. of hist. socs. and depts., report (1920), 132–134.
Foreign archieves. *See* Obtaining transcripts from foreign archives, A. H. A. com.
Fox, Dixon R., chairman hereditary patriotic socs. com. (1921), 22, 108.
France, royal power in, 191–193.
Francis, David R., of local arrangements com. (1921), 20, 108.
Frederick II, of Germany, 195.
Frederick the Great, enlightened despotism of, 190, 195.
Frederick William, *elector of* Brandenburg, 195.
Frederick William I, of Prussia, 195.
Free Oeconomical Society, 296, 299.
Free Thought, Yesterday and To-day, Robinson, 40.
French archives, calendaring, 133.
Fronczak, of Polish National Com., 201.
Frontier in American History, Turner, 150.
Frontiers Well Defended, Mather, 244.
Fuel Administration. *See* U. S. Fuel Administration.
Fuller, George N., of conf. of hist. socs. com. on handbk. of hist. socs. (1921), 21, 132.
G. J. A. Ducher, Nussbaum, 84, 102.
Galen, 175, 176.
Galicia, 203, 205, 206, 207.
Gallatin, Albert, letter from Philadelphia merchants, 255.
Gambrill, J. Montgomery, of membership com. (1921), 21, 108.
Garrison, Fielding H., RECENT REALIGNMENT IN THE HISTORY OF MEDIEVAL MEDICINE AND SCIENCE, 40, 173–178.
George L. Beer prize, com. to formulate rules for (1921), 20, 101, 105; establishment of, 51, 60; policy com. recommendation, 71, 103; account of, 81; bequest for, 101.
Germany, *Spartacist Uprising*, 43; enlightened despotism, 190; treaties of Westphalia, 194.
Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis, Du Cange, 181.
Godard, George S., chairman conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 21, 38, 131; patriotic socs., 152.
God's Frown in the Death of Usefull Men, Stoddard, 231.
Gorges, *Sir* Ferdinando, influence on settlement of Plymouth, 45, 211–221; attempt to wreck New England Puritanism, 241.
Gorges, John, married a daughter of Countess of Lincoln, 218.
Gosnold, return from Buzzards Bay, 212.
Grabski, 207.
Gratz, Benjamin, of local arrangements com. (1921), 20, 108.
Great Civil War, 191.
Great Western Railway, 277.
Greely, John N., *What Happens in Battle*, 89, 105.
Greene, Evart B., chairman program com. (1921), 20, 104; conf. of hist. socs. com. on coop. of hist. socs. and depts., report (1920), 132–134.
Griffin, A. P. C., of conf. of hist. socs. com. on bibliog. of hist. socs. (1921), 21, 132; continuation of bibliog. of pubs. of Am. and Canadian hist. socs., 69; *Bibliog. of Hist. Socs.*, 77.
Griffin, Grace G., *Writings on Am. Hist.*, 77, 83.
Gristmill, in Puritan colonies, 234.
Growth of Autocracy in the Roman Empire, McFayden, 41.
Gundlach, John H., of local arrangements com. (1921), 20, 108.
Gypsum, use for fertilizing, 288.
Hamilton, J. G. de Roulhac, of nominations com. (1920), 99.
Handbook of historical societies, conf. of hist. socs. com. on (1921), 21, 38, 132; recommended, 87.
Hansen, M. L., *Welfare Campaigns in Iowa*, 148.
Hapsburg Empire, Break-up of the, Coolidge, 43.
Harper & Bros., proposed manual of hist. lit., 94.
Hart, Albert B., life councilor, A. H. A., 13, 19; *Am. Yr. Bk.*, 82; of military hist. prize spec. com. (1913–1920), 89.
Haskins, Charles H., 1st vice pres. A. H. A. (1921), 13, 19, 52, 57; chairman agenda com. (1921), 19, 107; report of policy com. (1920), 56, 67–73, 102–104 delegate to Am. Council of Learned Socs., 60; present at council meeting, 100, 102, 103, 105, 107.
Hawaii, *Opportunities for Historical Research*, 119–121.
Hawaii, University of, 121.
Hawaiian Historical Society, 120, 121.
Hawkins, *Sir* John, attempted voyage to New England, 214.
Hay, Thomas R., awarded Robert M. Johnston prize, 51, 66, 89, 105; *Hood's Tenn. Campaign*, 66, 89, 105.
Hayes, Carlton J. H., councilor, A. H. A. (1921), 14, 19, 52, 57; of agenda com. (1921), 19, 107; of appointments com. (1921), 19, 108; chairman program com. (1920), 35; address, 36; present at council meeting, 107.

Helmholtz, Hermann L. F., work in electromagnetism, 277.
Henry IV, *king of* France, asserted religious toleration, 192.
Henry, Joseph, electromagnets, 277–278.
Herbert Baxter Adams prize, com. on (1921), 20–21, 104; conditions of award, 27; list of awards, 28, 84; policy com. recommendations, 71; account of, 80.
Hereditary patriotic societies, A. H. A. com. (1921), 22, 104, 108; policy com. recommendations, 70, 103.
HERITAGE OF THE PURITANS, Muzzey, 45, 237–249.
Hessian fly, Cazenove journal, 290.
Hicks, John D., *Political Career of Ignatius Donnelly*, 48.
High school history courses, 91–92.
Historic highways, A. H. A. com. (1915), 82
Historic sites, A. H. A. activities, 82.
Historical celebrations, A. H. A. activities, 75.
Historical congress at Rio de Janeiro, A. H A. spec. com. (1921), 23, 105; report (1920), 66, 90–91.
Historical congresses, A. H. A. activities at, 75.
Historical documentary publications, U. S., 77.
Historical essays, A. H. A. memorial vol. abandoned, 84.
Historical manuscripts commission, members (1921), 20, 104; report (1920), 66, 83; policy com. recommendation, 68, 103; activities, 75–76.
Historical Outlook, board of editors (1921), 22, 105, 107; account of, 79.
Historical research, opportunities, 115–121.
Historical Retrospect, Channing, 35.
Historical Section, Navy Dept. *See* U. S. Historical Section.
Historical societies, bibliog. of pubs., 69; A. H. A. activities for, 79; *Coordination within the States*, 131, 150. *See also* Conference of historical societies.
Historical studies, policy com. recommendations, 71.
Historical study of colonies and dependencies, A. H. A. spec. com. (1898–1900), 82.
History and education for citizenship in the schools, conference on rept. of A. H. A. com. (1920), 37, 38–39, 107; A. H. A. com. report (1920), 66, 91–94; discharge of com., 103, 106.
History courses, 91–92.
History of Labor in the United States, Commons, 161,
History of Plymouth Plantation, Bradford, 215–216.
HISTORY OF THE RANCH CATTLE INDUSTRY IN OKLAHOMA, Dale, 307–322.
History of the Town of Southampton (N. Y.), Adams, 151.
History Teachers' Magazine, account of, 79.
History teaching in the schools, A. H. A. com. (1921), 22, 39, 108; policy com. recommendations, 70, 103; account of committees, 78.
Hockett, Homer C., *American Background of Federalism*, 46.
Hodder, Frank H., chairman nominations com. (1921), 20, 52, 57; unable to serve on Justin Winsor prize com., 83; of nominations com. (1920), 99.
Holbrook, Franklin F., *Collection of State War Records*, 135.
Holland Land Company, 290.
Holt, Lucius H., ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW POLAND, 43–44, 199–208.
Holy Roman Empire, enlightened despotism in, 193, 196.
Hood's Tennessee campaign, Hay, 66, 89, 105.
Hoover collection, Lutz, 115–117.
House, R. B., of military hist. com. (1921), 22, 104.
Howe, Sheldon J., of membership com. (1921), 21, 108.
Howland, Arthur C., of service com. (1921), 22, 108.
Huidekoper, Frederick L., Thirty-third Div. hist., 147.
Humphreys, David, agricultural gatherings, 300.
Hunt, Gaillard, of hist. mss. comm. (1921), 20, 104; address, 36.
Hunt, M. Berna, of membership com. (1921), 21, 108.
Hunt, R. D., *Contribution of Political Science to Education*, 122–123.
Hunt, *Capt.* Thomas, visit to Plymouth, 214.
Huntington Library collection of Am. hist., 119.
Hutchinson, Anne, trial, 244.
Illinois, war records collection, 136, 137, 138, 142, 143; posters, 144; newspapers, 144; roster, 147.
Illinois Manufacturers Assoc., 143.
Illinois State Historical Library, *Statistics rel. to Ill. and the War*, 148; *Documents rel. to Ill. and the War*, 148.
Importance of Economics in the Training and Teaching of History, Sumner, 123.
Incas, Communistic System of the, Belaunde, 44.
Indian Territory, cattle industry, 312.
Indiana, war records collection, 136, 137, 141; posters, 144; newspapers, 144; gold star vol., 146.
Indiana Historical Commission, hist. of 5 Liberty loans, 148.
Indiana State Historical Society, calendaring French archives, 133.
Individual service records, 146–147.
Influence of the Agricultural Fair upon American Society, 1850–1851, Kellar, 47.
Ingersoll, Charles J., description of effect of embargo in Philadelphia, 260–261.
Instituto Historico, 90.
International language, 42, 179–186.
International Molders' Union, 159.
International Research Council, com. on internatl. auxiliary language, 186.
International Typographical Union, 159.
International Union of Academies, 71, 74.
Iowa, war records collection, 136, 142, 146–147.
Iowa and War, 145.
Iowa Chronicles of the World War, 148.
Iowa Indian Reservation, opened to settlement, 321.
Iowa, State Historical Society of, calendaring French archives, 133; *Iowa and War*, 145; *Iowa Chronicles of the World War*, 148.
James, Herman G., *Recent Constitutional Changes in Latin America*, 49.

Jameson, John Franklin, life councilor, A. H. A., 13, 19; managing editor, board of editors, *American Historical Review* (1921), 20; of publications com. (1921), 21, 104; chairman natl. archives com. (1921), 21, 104; chairman com. on obtaining transcripts from foreign archives (1921), 22, 104, 108; chairman service com. (1921), 22, 104; chairman documentary hist. pubs. of U. S. spec. com. (1921), 23, 105; delegate to Am. Council of Learned Socs., 60; *Writings on Am. Hist.*, 77; *Original narratives of Early Am. Hist.*, 81; report of nat. archives com. (1920), 88; report of London headquarters com. (1920), 100; present at council meetings, 100, 102, 103, 105, 107; conf. of hist. socs. com. on coop. of hist. socs. and depts., report (1920), 132-134.

Januszajtis, *Colonel*, attempted coup d'état, 206.

Jaworski, 201, 202.

Jefferson, Thomas, cyphers of aristocracy, 246; embargo, 247.

John of Salisbury, 183.

John Wesley, Tory, Sweet, 46.

Johnson, Henry, chairman hist. teaching in the schools com. (1921), 22, 39, 108; *Local and Am. Hist. in Grades II-VI*, 39; *World Hist. in the High School*, 39; courses in hist., 93.

Johnston, Robert M., editor *Military Historian and Economist*, 80; chairman military hist. prize spec. com. (1916-1918), 89.

Jones, *Captain*, of Mayflower, 45, 217.

Jones, Breckinridge, of local arrangements com. (1921), 20, 108.

Jones, *Mrs.* Robert M., of local arrangements com. (1921), 20, 108.

Joule, James P., work in electromagnetism, 276.

Journal of European history, A. H. A. com. on (1916), hist. studies proposal, 103.

Jusserand, Jean J., pres. A. H. A. (1921), 13, 19, 52, 57; of agenda com. (1921), 19, 107; chairman appointments com. (1921), 19, 108; chairman writing of hist. spec. com. (1921), 23, 51, 105; reception to A. H. A., 35; present at council meeting, 100.

Justin Winsor prize, com. (1921), 20, 104; conditions of award, 27; list of awards, 27-28; report (1920), 66, 83, 101; policy com. recommendation, 71; account of, 80.

Kakowski, *Archbishop*, 204.

Kalm, Peter, fallow fields, 287.

Kansas State Historical Society, calendaring French archives, 133.

Kellar, Herbert A., *Influence of the Agricultural Fair upon American Society, 1830-1851*, 47.

Kelsey, Rayner W., DESCRIPTION AND TRAVEL AS SOURCE MATERIAL FOR THE HISTORY OF EARLY AGRICULTURE IN PENNSYLVANIA, 283-292.

Kelvin, *Sir* William Thomson, *Lord*, work in electromagnetism, 277.

Kendrick, Benjamin B., AGRARIAN DISCONTENT IN THE SOUTH: 1880-1900, 48-49, 265-272.

Kennelly, Arthur E., DEVELOPMENT OF ELECTROMAGNETISM DURING THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS, 40, 273-281.

Kentucky, war records collection, 136, 138.

Ket's Rebellion, 191.

Kholm, ceded to Ukrainia, 204.

Kiev, Russia, 165, 167.

Kimball, Fiske, *Architecture in the History of the Colonies and of the Republic*, 46.

Kinnicutt, Lincoln N., SETTLEMENT OF PLYMOUTH CONTEMPLATED BEFORE 1620, 45, 209-221.

Klein, Julius, sec. hist. congress at Rio de Janeiro spec. com. (1921), 23, 105; *Monroe Doctrine as a Regional Understanding*, 49; report Hist. cong. at Rio de Janeiro spec. com. (1920), 90-91.

Knowlton, Daniel C., of board of editors, *Hist. Outlook* (1921), 22, 105, 107; of hist. teaching in the schools com. (1921), 22, 108; address, 39; course in modern world hist., 92.

Korff, *Baron*, chairman of joint session, 35.

Krey, A. C., of membership com. (1921), 21, 104, (1920), 84.

Kucharewski, of Polish cabinet, 204.

Labor, hist. of, in U. S., 161.

Larned, J. N., *Literature of Am. Hist.*, 77.

Larson, Laurence M., of membership com. (1921), 21, 108; of board of editors, *Hist. Outlook* (1921) 22, 105.

Latin America, *Recent Constitutional Changes*, 49.

Latin American history, *Opportunities for Historical Research*, 117-118.

LATIN AS AN INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE IN THE MIDDLE AGES, Paetow, 42, 179-186.

Laurens, Henry, business letters, 45.

League of Nations, *Pan Americanism and*, 49.

Learned, H. Barrett, letter transmitting ann. rept., 7; of disposition of records spec. com. (1921), 20; chairman publications com. (1921), 21, 104; chairman local arrangements com. (1920), 35; report of publications com. (1920), 83-84; present at council meeting, 100.

Lebanon, Pa., Cazenove journal, 291.

Leebrick, K. C., *Brief Statement of the Opportunities for Historical Research in Hawaii*, 119-121.

Legal history, A. H. A. com. (1897), 82.

Leiper, Thomas, statement of effect of embargo, 255.

Leland, Waldo G., chairman disposition of records spec. com. (1921), 20; of public archives comm. (1921), 22, 104; of com. on obtaining transcripts from foreign archives (1921), 22, 104; at meeting of policy com., 67; activities of A. H. A (1884-1920), 73-82; at meeting of membership com., 84, 85; report of disposition of records com. (1920), 102; of univ. center for higher studies in Washington (1920), 105; com. of one on reduced railroad rates, 107.

Leo, *Doctor*, 201.

Liberty loans, Ind., 148.

Librarian of Congress. *See* U. S. Librarian of Congress.

Lighthouse Service. *See* U. S. Lighthouse Service.

Lima, Manoel de Oliveira. *See* Oliveira Lima, Manoel de.

Lincoln, Natalie S., of hereditary patriotic socs. com. (1921), 22, 108.

Lingelbach, William E., of nominations com. (1921), 20, 52, 57; present at council meetings, 100, 102, 103, 105.

List of Commissions and Instructions to Colonial Governors, 76.

List of Journals and Acts of Colonial Legislatures, 76.

List of Representations and Reports of the Board of Trade, 76.

Literature of American History, Larned, 77.

Livingstone, Robert R., agricultural gatherings, 300.
Local and American History in Grades II–VI, Johnson, 39.
Local com. of A. H. A. (1921), 20, 108.
Lodge, Henry C., of documentary hist. pubs. of the U. S. com. (1921), 105.
Logan, John H., of membership com. (1921), 21, 108.
Logan, William, drill plow, 301.
London Company, negotiations with Pilgrims, 218.
London headquarters, A. H. A. com. on (1920), discharged, 65; purpose of, 74; final report, 100, 101.
Long, Breckenridge, of local arrangements com. (1921), 20, 108.
Lortchins, C. G., report of Am. Audit Co. on A. H. A., finances, 63–65.
Louis VII, *king of* France, expelled foreign students, 183.
Louisiana Historical Society, calendaring French archives, 133.
Lowell, A. L., *Colonial Civil Service*, 82.
Lubomirski, *Prince*, 204.
Lutz, Ralph H., *Spartacist Uprising in Germany*, 43; paper on Hoover collection, 115–117; chairman P. C. B. nominations (1920), report, 121.
Luxemburg, aspirations, 43.
Lydecker, Robert C., *Archives of Hawaii*, 121.
McFayden, Donald, *Growth of Autocracy in the Roman Empire*, 41.
McGuire, Constantine E., of hist. congress at Rio de Janeiro spec. com. (1921), 23, 105.
McIlwain, Charles H., of Herbert Baxter Adams prize com. (1921), 20 104.
McKinley, Albert E., of service com. (1921), 22, 108; managing editor, board of editors, *Hist. Outlook* (1921), 22; of hist. teaching in the schools com. (1921), 22, 108; *Suggestions and Plans for State and Local Publications of War History*, 37, 131; sec. Natl. Assoc. of State War Hist. Organizations, 85; PROGRESS IN THE COLLECTION OF WAR HISTORY RECORDS BY STATE WAR HISTORY ORGANIZATIONS, 145–152.
Mackoy, Harry B., of hereditary patriotic socs. com. (1921), 22, 108.
McLaughlin, Andrew C., life councilor, A. H. A., 14, 19.
McMaster, John B., life councilor, A. H. A., 13, 19; present at council meeting, 100.
McMillan, *Mrs.* N. A., of local arrangements com. (1921), 20, 108.
Macmillan Co., loss on publication of *Am. Hist. Rev.*, 82.
Mandates, 44.
Manual of Historical Literature, Adams, 51, 69, 77, 95.
Manual of historical literature, A. H. A. spec. com. (1920), 51; report, 66, 94–99; continuing, 103; publication authorized, 107.
Manufacturing, *Control by Confederate Government*, 48.
Maria Theresa, enlightened despotism of, 190, 196, 197.
Marine Corps. *See* U. S. Marine Corps.
Marshall, Thomas M., of program com. (1921), 20, 104; of local arrangements com. (1921), 20, 108.
Martin, Percy A., act. chairman hist. congress at Rio de Janeiro spec. com. (1921), 23, 105, (1920), 90; *Opportunities for Historical Research in Latin Amer. Hist.*, 117–118; of P. C. B. resolutions com. (1920), 121.
Maryland, war records collection, 136, 137, 140; Council of Defense files, 143; war history, 149.
Massachusetts, hist. material, 151.
Massachusetts Society for Promoting Agriculture, 299.
Mather, Cotton, *Two Brief Discourses*, 230, 231; *Serviceable Man*, 231; *Frontiers Well Defended*, 244.
Mather, Increase, diary, 242.
Maxwell, James C., electromagnetic waves, 278
Mayer, work in electromagnetism, 277.
Mayflower, Pilgrim ship, 211, 216, 217, 218, 220, 239.
Mayflower compact, 245.
Meany, Edmond S., documentary hist. of States. proposed, 81–82; discussion of federation of hist. socs., 85.
Meat packing, 47–48.
Medicine, medieval, 40, 173–178.
Medieval industry, 42.
Medieval medicine and science, 40, 173–178.
Meetings and relations, A. H. A. com. (1921), 19,108.
Melvin, Frank E., of membership com. (1921), 21, 104, (1920), 84.
Membership, A. H. A. com. (1921), 21, 104, 108; (1920) report, 66, 84–85.
Merriman, Roger B., of bibliog. of modern English hist. spec. com. (1921), 22, 105.
Michigan, war records collection, 136, 137.
Michigan Historical Society, calendaring French archives, 133.
Milan Decree, 253.
Miles, John D., rental of Indian lands, 314, 315.
Military Historian and Economist, 80.
Military history, A. H. A. com. (1921), 22, 104; policy com. recommendations, 70–71, 103; A. H. A. activities, 80.
Military history prize, A. H. A. spec. com. (1920), final report, 89–90, 105. *See also* Robert M. Johnston prize.
Minnesota, war records collection, 136, 137, 143; war relics, 144; war history, 145, 148.
Mississippi, State Dept. of Archives and Hist., calendaring French archives, 133.
Mississippi Valley, calendar of Parisian archives rel. to, 38, 79, 132.
Mississippi Valley Historical Association, joint session with A. H. A. (1920), 34; activities, 73.
Missouri, roster, 147.
Missouri, State Historical Society of, calendaring French archives, 133.
Mitchell, Margaret J., of membership com. (1921), 21, 108
Modell of Christian Charity, Winthrop, 232.
Modern Language Association of America, com. on internatl. language, 186.
Mohawk Valley Historical Association, 152.
Monographic History of the U. S., 82.
Monroe Doctrine as a Regional Understanding, Klein, 49.
Moore, Charles, treas. A. H. A. (1921), 13, 19, 52, 57; of agenda com. (1921), 19, 107; chairman finance com. (1921), 19, 108; of natl. archives com. (1921), 21, 104; of documentary hist. pubs. of U. S. (1921), 23, 105; address, 36; report as treasurer (1920), 61–63; at meeting of policy com., 67; present at council meetings, 100, 102, 103, 105, 107.
Moraczowski, premier of cabinet, 205, 206.
Moran, Thomas F., of Justin Winsor prize com. (1921), 20, 104.

Morehouse, Frances, courses in civics and Am. hist., 92; payment to, 106.
Mores, *Marquis* of, in ranch cattle business, 311.
Morgan, Edwin V., of hist. congress at Rio de Janeiro spec. com. (1921), 23, 90, 105.
Morgan, William T., *English Political Parties and Leaders in the Reign of Queen Anne*, 84.
Morse, S. F. B., electromagnetic telegraph, 278.
Morton, Nathaniel, *Memorial*, 217-218.
Moses, Bernard, hon. chairman hist. congress at Rio de Janeiro spec. com. (1921), 23, 105; (1920), 90.
Munro, Dana C., resigns from bd. of editors of *Am. Hist. Review*, 65; report of policy com. (1920), 67-73; chairman journal of European hist. com. (1916), 103; of univ. center for higher studies in Washington com. (1920), 105.
Muzzey, David S., of Herbert Baxter Adams prize com. (1921), 21, 104; HERITAGE OF THE PURITANS, 45, 237-249.
National archives, A. H. A. com. (1921), 21, 104; policy com. recommendations, 69,103; activities, 76-77; report (1920), 88.
National archives building, 88.
National Association of State War History Organizations, joint meeting (1920), 37, 85, 131.
National Catholic War Council, war records, 145.
National Highways Association, 82.
National Museum. *See* U. S. National Museum.
Nebraska, war records collection, 136.
Neilson, Nellie, of Herbert Baxter Adams prize com. (1921), 21, 104.
New England, *Agricultural Revolution, 1815-1860*, 47.
New Hampshire, war records collection, 137.
New Jersey, war records collection, 136.
New York (*State*), federations of hist. socs., 38; war records collection, 136, 138; posters, 144; newspapers, 144; roster, 147; war history, 148.
New York Society for Agriculture, Arts and Manufactures, 299.
New York Society for Promoting Arts, 296.
Newhall, Richard A., of membership com. (1921), 21, 104, (1920), 84.
Newspapers, war files, 144-145.
Nominations, A. H. A. com. on (1921), 20; report (1920), 57, 99.
North Carolina, war records collection, 136.
North Virginia Company, possible understanding with Pilgrims, 219.
Notestein, Wallace, of bibliog. of modern English hist. spec. com. (1921), 22, 105.
Nussbaum, F. L., *E. J. A. Ducher*, 84 102.
Oats, Cazenove journal, 290.
Obtaining transcripts from foreign archives, A. H. A. com. (1921), 22, 104; policy com. recommendation, 69, 103.
Oersted, Hans C., discovers electromagnetism, 275.
Ohio, war records collection, 136; newspapers, 144.
Oklahoma, HIST. OF THE RANCH CATTLE INDUSTRY, 307-322.
Oliveira Lima, Manoel de, of hist. congress at Rio de Janeiro spec. com. (1921), 23, 105; *Pan Americanism and the League of Nations*, 49.
Olsen, Nils A., of program com. (1921), 20, 104.
Opportunities for Historical Research in Latin American History, Martin, 117-118.
Orders in Council, 253.
ORIGIN OF THE RUSSIAN STATE ON THE DNIEPER. Rostovtsev, 41-42, 163-171.
Original Narratives of Early American History, Jameson, 81.
Orvis, J. S., of membership com. (1920), 84.
Ossetes, 170.
Ostrogoths, 169.
Ostrowski, *Count*, 204.
Pacific Coast Branch, officers elected for 1921, 15, 121-122; activities, 73; PROCEEDINGS OF SIXTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING (1920), 113-127.
Packard, Laurence B., of membership com. (1921), 21, 108.
Paderewski, of Polish Natl. Com., 201, 205; forms cabinet, 206; resigns, 207.
Paetow, Louis J., LATIN AS AN INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE IN THE MIDDLE AGES, 42, 179-186.
Palestine, Syria, and Mandates, Duggan, 44.
Paltsits, Victor H., chairman public archives comm. (1921), 22, 104; proposed to abolish "primary," 52, 57, 58; report of nominations com. (1920), 57, 99; report of primer of archives com. (1920), 99.
Pan Americanism and the League of Nations, Oliveira Lima, 49.
Panticapæum, 169.
Parish, John C., of program com. (1921), 20, 104; of conf. of hist. socs. (1921), 21, 104; of conf. of hist. socs. com. on hndbk. of hist. socs. (1921), 21, 132; report of conf. of hist. socs. (1920), 85-88, 129-252.
Patriotic societies, conference (1916), 80. *See also* Hereditary patriotic societies, A. H. A. com.
Patuxet, 213.
Paullin, C. O., of disposition of records spec. com. (1921), 20.
Paxson, Frederic L., councilor, A. H. A. (1921), 14, 19, 52, 57; of agenda com. (1921), 19, 107; of finance com. (1921), 19, 108; of com. to cooperate with Peoples of Am. Soc. (1921), 23, 108; report of Justin Winsor prize com. (1920), 83.
Peace Conference at Paris, 1919, Polish interests before, 207.
Penn, William, letter to James Harrison, 286.
Pennsylvania, war records collection, 136, 137-138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143; posters, 144; war history, 145; roster, 147; DESCRIPTION AND TRAVEL AS SOURCE MATERIAL FOR THE HISTORY OF EARLY AGRICULTURE, Kelsey, 283-292.
Peoples of America Society, A. H. A. spec. com. to cooperate with (1921), 23, 101, 106, 108.
Peters, Richard, use of gypsum for fertilizing, 288.
Petrie, George, of membership com. (1921), 21, 108.
Pettus, Charles P., of local arrangements com. (1921), 20, 108.
Philadelphia, Pa., war records collection, 138.
Philadelphia Agriculture Society, *Memoirs*, 288.
PHILADELPHIA AND THE EMBARGO OF 1808, Sears, 47, 251-263.
Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Agriculture, 296, 297-298.
Philip IV, *king of* France, ordered foreign students protected, 184.
Photographs. *See* War photographs.
Pilgrimage of Grace, 191.
Pilgrims, circumstances of settlement, 217-221.
Pilsudski, *Gen.*, recruits Polish legions, 202; plan for Polish army, 203; imprisoned, 204; made chief of state, 204-205.

Piltz, of Polish Natl. Com., 201.
Pittsfield, Mass., agricultural meeting, 1807, 301.
Pliny, 175.
PLYMOUTH, SETTLEMENT CONTEMPLATED BEFORE 1620, 45, 209-221.
Pocanawket Confederacy, 216.
Poland, ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW, 43-44, 199-208.
Policy, A. H. A., spec. com., report (1920), 50-51, 67-73, 102-104; report adopted by executive com., 102-104.
Polish legions, 202.
Polish National Council, 201.
Polish Parliamentary Club at Vienna, memorial, 203.
Political Career of Ignatius Donnelly, Hicks, 48.
Political science, contribution to education, 122-123.
Posnania, 203, 205, 206, 207.
Posters, war collections, 143-144.
Potawatomi Reservation, opened to settlement, 321.
Practical Godliness the Way to Prosperity, Whitman, 231.
Price fixing, Mass. colony, 233.
Prichard, Walter, of membership com. (1921), 21, 108.
Primer of archives, A. H. A. spec. com. (1920), 76, report (1920), 99.
Pring, Martin, return from Cape Cod Bay, 212; at New Plymouth, 213.
Priscian, 185.
Privy-Council Register, transcription of colonial entries, 81.
Prize essays. *See* Herbert Baxter Adams prize.—Justin Winsor prize.—Military history prize.—Robert M. Johnston prize.
Problem of Control in Medieval Industry, Evans, 42.
Program of annual meeting, com. *See* Annual meeting of A. H. A., program com.
PROGRESS IN THE COLLECTION OF WAR HISTORY RECORDS BY STATE WAR HISTORY ORGANIZATIONS, McKinley, 145-152.
PROGRESS IN THE COLLECTION OF WAR RECORDS BY STATE WAR HISTORY ORGANIZATIONS, Singewald, 37, 131, 135-145.
Protestant Reformation in England, 191.
Protestantische Ethik und der "Geist" des Kapitalismus, Weber, 226, 228-230.
Prothero, George W., editor bibliog. of modern English hist., 88.
Public archives commission, members (1921), 22, 104; policy com. recommendations, 68-69, 103; activities, 76.
Public Health Service. *See* U. S. Public Health Service.
Publications, A. H. A. com. (1921), 21, 104; report (1920), 66, 83-84.
PURITAN COLONIES, CAPITALISTIC AND SOCIALISTIC TENDENCIES, Day, 44-45, 223-235.
PURITANS, HERITAGE OF THE, Muzzey, 45, 237-249.
Putnam, Eben, of military hist. com. (1921), 22, 104.
Putnam, Herbert, presides at joint session, 34.
Putnam, Ruth, councilor, A. H. A. (1921), 14, 19, 52, 57; of meetings and relations com. (1921), 19, 108; *Aspirations of One Small State*, 43; present at council meetings, 100, 102, 103, 105, 107.
Quaife, M. M., of bibliog. of Am. travel subcom. (1921), 22, 108.
Railroad Administration. *See* U. S. Railroad Administration.
Railroad rates, A. H. A. com. on reduced (1921), 107.
Rammelkamp, Charles H., of membership com. (1921), 21, 108.
Ramsdell, Charles W., of membership com. (1921), 21, 104, (1920), 84; *Control of Manufacturing by the Confederate Government*, 48.
Ranch cattle industry, 307-322.
Randall, J. C., of membership com. (1920), 84.
Randolph, Peyton, against resolutions condemning stamp act, 246.
Read, Conyers, chairman Herbert Baxter Adams prize com. (1921), 20, 104; of bibliog. of modern English hist. spec. com. (1921), 22, 105.
Recent Constitutional Changes in Latin America, James, 49.
RECENT REALIGNMENT IN THE HISTORY OF MEDIEVAL MEDICINE AND SCIENCE, Garrison, 40, 173-178.
RECOGNITION OF ECONOMIC HISTORY AS A DISTINCT SUBJECT, Day, 155-156.
Records. *See* Disposition of records, A. H. A. com. on.—Revolutionary records, A. H. A. com.—War records.
Red Cross, war records, 141, 142.
Red Cross in Iowa, 148.
Reinsch, Paul S., pres. Am. Political Science Assoc., 34; *Secret Diplomacy: How Far Can It Be Eliminated?* 35.
Religious Influences in the History of the West, Young, 123-124.
Research in American and European history, A. H. A. com. (1912), 81.
Revolution of 1688, 191.
Revolutionary records, A. H. A. com. (1914), 80.
Rhode Island, war records collection, 137.
Rhodes, James F., life councilor, A. H. A., 13, 19.
Rice, Harry M., report of Am. Audit Co. on A. H. A. finances, 63-65.
Richthofen, *Baron*, in ranch cattle business, 311.
Rio de Janeiro. *See* Historical congress.
Rising of the North, 191.
Robert M. Johnston prize, award of, 51, 66, 105; policy com. recommendation, 71, 103; account of, 80-81.
Robinson, James H., *Free Thought, Yesterday and To-day*, 40.
Robinson, Morgan P., of membership com. (1921), 21, 108.
Roman alphabet, 183.
Roman Empire, *Growth of Autocracy*, 41.
Roosevelt, Theodore, in ranch cattle business, 311.
Ross, Edward A., speech, 34.
Rostovtsev, Mikhail, ORIGIN OF THE RUSSIAN STATE ON THE DNIEPER, 41-42, 163-171.
Rowcroft, *Capt.*, Dermer fails to meet, 215.
Rowe, Leo S., director gen. Pan Am. Union, 35, 90.
Rowland, Dunbar, chairman of com. on calendar of documents in Parisian archives rel. to Miss. Valley, 38; chairman of conf. of hist. socs. com. on coop. of hist. socs. and depts., report (1920), 132-134.
Royal Historical Soc., 100.
RUSSIAN STATE ON THE DNIEPER, Rostovtsev, 41-42, 163-171.
Sac and Fox Reservation, opened to settlement, 321.
Sale of War Bonds in Iowa, 148.
Salerno, medical school at, 176.
Sapieha, *Prince*, attempted coup d'état, 206.

Schafer, Joseph, chairman conf. of hist. socs. com. on bibliog. of hist. socs. (1921), 21, 132; *Wis. Domesday Book*, 38; of Wis. State Hist. Soc., 85; report hist. and educa. in the schools com. (1920), 91–93; present at council meeting, 100; *Coordination of Historical Societies within the States*, 131, 150.
Schmidt, Louis B., AGRICULTURE AS A FIELD FOR HIST. RESEARCH (abstract), 161–162.
Schmitt, Bernadotte E., of Herbert Baxter Adams prize com. (1921), 21, 104.
Schouler, James, memorial, 57, 58, 101; portrait, 100.
Schurz, William S., of hist. congress at Rio de Janeiro (1921), 23, 105.
Science, medieval, 40, 173–178.
Scott, Arthur P., of membership com. (1921), 21, 104, (1920), 84.
Sears, Louis M., of membership com. (1921), 21, 108; PHILADELPHIA AND THE EMBARGO OF 1808, 47, 251–263.
Secret Diplomacy: How Far Can It Be Eliminated, Reinsch, 35.
Service, A. H. A. com. on (1921), 22, 104, 108; policy com. recommendations, 72, 104.
Serviceable Man, Mather, 231.
SETTLEMENT OF PLYMOUTH CONTEMPLATED BEFORE 1620, 45, 209–221.
Seven Years' War, 196.
Seventy-ninth Division, orders and messages, 140.
Seydler, von, cabinet, 204.
Seymour, Charles, of program com. (1921), 20, 104.
Shambaugh, Benjamin F., of bibliog. of Am. travel subcom. (1921), 22, 108; conf. of hist. socs. com. on coop. of hist. socs. and depts., report (1920), 132–134.
Shearer, Augustus H., of membership com. (1921), 21, 108; of bibliog. com. (1921), 22, 104; sec. of conf. of hist. socs. (1916), 86, 87; proposed manual of hist. lit., 95–97.
Sheridan, *Gen.*, quiets Cheyenne-Arapaho Reservation, 315.
Shipman, Henry R., of bibliog. com. (1921), 22, 104; proposed manual of hist. lit., 95–97.
Shipping Board. *See* U. S. Shipping Board.
Short, William, effect of embargo in Philadelphia, 261.
Shotwell, James T., councilor, A. H. A. (1921), 14, 19, 52, 57; of meetings and relations com. (1921), 19, 108.
Show, Arley B., resolutions on death of, 121.
Siebert, Wilbur H., of Herbert Baxter Adams prize com. (1921), 21, 104.
Signal Corps. *See* U. S., Signal Corps.
Sin and Danger of Self-Love, Cushman, 229.
Singer, Dorothea W., catalogued mss. of Middle Ages, 178.
Singewald, Karl, PROGRESS IN THE COLLECTION OF WAR RECORDS BY STATE WAR HISTORY ORGANIZATIONS, 37, 131, 135–145.
Sinn Fein, Turner, 43.
Sioussat, *Mrs.* Albert, patriotic societies, 152.
Sioussat, Annie L., of hereditary patriotic socs. com. (1921), 22, 108.
Sioussat, St. George L., councilor, A. H. A. (1921), 14, 19, 52, 57; of finance com. (1921), 19, 108; present at council meeting, 107.
Skirment, of Polish Natl. Com., 201.
Skulski, resigns, 207.
Slave Trade into South Carolina before the Revolution, Donnan, 45.
Slavs, 166, 170.
Sloane, William M., life councilor, A. H. A., 14, 19.
Smith, *Capt.* John, sent to north part of Va., 213–214, 220; attempted settlement in New England, 214, 215.
Smith, Justin H., chairman hist. mss. comm. (1921), 20, 104; of publications com. (1921), 21, 104; report of hist, mss. comm. (1920), 83.
Sobanski, of Polish Natl. Com., 201.
Social Sciences and Education for Citizenship in the Schools, Bliss, 124.
Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, 295.
Soranus, 175.
South, AGRARIAN DISCONTENT, 48–49, 265–272.
South Carolina, Slave Trade before the Revolution, Donnan, 45.
South Carolina Agricultural Society, 296, 299.
South Carolina Gazette, 45.
South Dakota, war records collection, 137.
South Virginia Company, negotiations with Pilgrims, 218.
Southampton, N. Y., hist., 151.
Southern History Association, activities, 74.
Sparks, Jared, tribute to Puritans, 248.
Spartacist Uprising in Germany, Lutz 43.
Spaulding, Oliver L., *jr.*, of natl. archives com. (1921), 21, 104; of military hist. com. (1921), 22, 104.
Sperry, Earl E., of membership com. (1921), 21, 108.
Squanto. *See* Tisquantum.
State war records, collection of, 135.
Statistics relative to Illinois and the War, 148.
Steiner, Bernard C., of Justin Winsor prize com. (1921), 20, 104.
Stewart, Anna, discussion of history teaching, 126–127.
Stoddard, Solomon, *God's Frown in the Death of Usefull Men*, 231.
Streeter, Edward C., textual study of medieval medicine, 178.
Study of History in Schools, 78.
Study of History in the Elementary Schools, 78.
Suggestions and Plans for State and Local Publications of War History, McKinley, 37, 131.
Sullivan, James, of service com. (1921), 22, 108; chairman conference of hist. socs. (1920), 37, 131; federations of hist. socs. in N. Y., 38, 152.
Sumner, George S., *Importance of Economics in the Training and Teaching of History*, 123.
Supreme National Committee in Poland, 201, 202, 204.
Surgeons, medieval, 176.
Sweet, William W., of Justin Winsor prize com. (1921), 20, 104; *John Wesley, Tory*, 46.
Swift, Eben, chairman military hist. com. (1921), 22, 104.
Syria, Palestine, and Mandates, Duggan, 44.
Telegraph, industrial development, 277.
Texas, war records collection, 136, 142, 143; posters, 143; cattle raising, 310–311.
Texas Historical Society, calendaring French archchives, 133.
Texas Rangers in the Mexican War, Webb, 89, 105.
Thayer, William R., life councilor, A. H. A., 14, 19.
Theology, Explained and Defended in a Series of Sermons, Dwight, 231.

Thirty-second Division, history, 147.
Thirty-third Division, history, 147.
Thirty Years' War, 194-195.
Thomas, David Y., of membership com. (1921), 21, 108.
Thompson, Alexander, fertilizes fields, 287.
Thompson, Frederic L., of membership com. (1921), 21, 108.
Three Episodes of New England History, Adams, 151.
Throop, George R., of local arrangements com. (1921), 20, 108.
Thurston, R. C. Ballard, of hereditary patriotic socs. com. (1921), 22, 108.
Tisquantum, and settlement of Plymouth, 45, 212, 213, 215, 216, 217.
Treat, Payson J., vice pres. P. C. B. (1921), 15, 121.
Treaties of Westphalia, 194.
Treaty of Dresden, 196.
Trenholme, Norman M., of program com. (1921), 20, 104; of membership com. (1921), 21, 108.
True, Rodney H., of publications com. (1921), 21, 104; pres. Agric. Hist. Soc., 34; EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF AGRIC. SOCS. IN THE U. S., 293-306.
Truman, Thomas, petition of distressed seamen, 256.
Tuell, Harriet, pres. New England Hist. Teachers' Assoc., 39.
Turner, *Prof., Frontier in Am. Hist.*, 150.
Turner, Edward R., *Sinn Fein*, 43.
Turner, Frederick, J. life councilor, A. H. A., 13, 19; address, 36; addresses, 243, 244.
Turner, Robert, letter to Wm. Penn, 287.
Tuttle, Julius H., of conf. of hist. socs. com. on bibliog. of hist. socs. (1921), 21, 132.
Two Brief Discourses, Mather, 230, 231
Ukrainia, Kholm ceded to, 204.
Union Académique Internationale, 60.
Union List of Collections on European Hist. in Am. Libraries, 77.
United Mine Workers, 159, 160.
U. S., hist. documentary pubs., 77; monographic hist., 82.
U. S. Adjutant-General, military record abstracts, 138, 140, 146.
U. S. Bureau of Navigation, naval record abstracts, 138.
U. S. Coast Guard, enrolled in Naval Reserve, 139.
U. S. Committee on Public Information, publications, 142.
U. S. Council of National Defense, war records, 141.
U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, bulletins, 142.
U. S. Food Administration, war records, 141, 143.
U. S. Fuel Administration, war records, 141, 143.
U. S. Historical Section, Navy Dept., A. H. A. com. to cooperate with, 106.
U. S. Librarian of Congress, vote of thanks to, 107.
U. S. Lighthouse Service, partly transferred to Navy Dept., 139.
U. S. Marine Corps, military record abstracts, 138.
U. S. National Museum, portrait of Jas. Schouler loaned to, 101.
U. S. Public Health Service, part of military forces, 139.
U. S. Railroad Administration, war records, 141.
U. S. Shipping Board, war records, 141.
U. S. Signal Corps, war photographs, 140.
U. S. War Industries Board, war records, 141.
U. S. War Loan Organization, war records, 141.
United States Food Administration in Iowa, 148.
United States Policy with Regard to Alaska, Farrar, 123.
University center for higher studies in Washington, 72, 81, 103; A. H. A. com. (1920), 105.
Usher, Abbott P., address, 36; FIELD FOR THE TEACHING OF ECONOMIC HISTORY IN COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS, 156-159.
Valla, Laurentius, *Elegantiæ Linguæ Latinæ*, 185.
Van Laer, Arnold J. F., of public archives comm. (1921), 22, 104.
Van Nostrand, J. J., *jr.*, sec.-treas. P. C. B. (1921), 15, 121; of membership com. (1921), 21, 104, (1920), 84.
Van Tyne, Claude H., of board of editors, *Am. Hist. Rev.* (1921), 20.
Venetian Republic, quarantine, 177.
Vesalius, 176.
Vignaud, Henry, birthday greetings, 60.
Villa Dei, Alexander de, *Doctrinale*, 185.
Vincent, John M., offers memorial of James Schouler, 57.
Vinci, Leonardo da, 176.
Vines, Richard, attempted settlement in New England, 214.
Violette, Eugene M., of hist. teaching in the schools com. (1921), 22, 108.
Virginia, war records collection, 136, 141; war history, 145.
Visigoths, 169.
Walcott, Charles D., letter of submittal to Cong., 3.
Walker, Williston, of board of editors, *Am. Hist. Rev.* (1921), 20, 65.
Walsh, J. J., speech, 34; pres. Am. Catholic Hist. Assoc. (1921), 34.
Walsh, James J., textual study of medieval medicine, 178.
War History, Suggestions and Plans for State and Local Publications of, McKinley, 37, 131.
War industries, records, 143.
War Industries Board. *See* U. S. War Industries Board.
War Loan Organization. *See* U. S. War Loan Organization.
War photographs, 140, 143.
War records, PROGRESS IN THE COLLECTION BY STATE WAR HISTORY ORGANIZATIONS, Singewald, 37, 131, 135-145; McKinley, 145-152.
Wars of the Roses, 190-191.
Warsaw, Poland, election, 206.
Washington, Patty W., asst. sec.-treas. A. H. A. (1921), 19; present at council meetings, 100, 102, 103, 105, 107.
Washington University, invitation, 57.
Watson, Elkanah, agricultural meeting, 300-301.
Webb, Walter P., *Texas Rangers in the Mexican War*, 89, 105.
Weber, Max, *Protestantische Ethik und der 'Geist' des Kapitalismus*, 226, 228-230.
Webster, Daniel, speeches on the Puritans, 239.
Welfare Campaigns in Iowa, Hansen, 148.
Welfare Work in Iowa, 148.
Welles, Sumner, act. chief Div. of Latin Am. Affairs, 90.

Wertenbaker, Thomas J., chairman membership com. (1921), 21, 59, 66, 104; report of membership com. (1920), 84-85, 102; present at council meeting, 102.
Wesley, John, *Calm Address to Our American Colonies*, 46.
Wesley, John, Tory, Sweet, 46.
Westergaard, Waldemar C., of ex. com. P. C. B. (1921), 15, 122; presided at P. C. B. meeting (1920), 115.
Westermann, William L., of board of editors, *Hist. Outlook* (1921), 22, 105.
Weymouth, explores coast of Maine, 212.
What Happens in Battle, Greely, 89, 105.
Wheat, Cazenove journal, 290.
Wheel and Industrial Union, 272.
Whincop, John, patent in name of, 218.
Whitman, *Practical Godliness the Way to Prosperity*, 231.
Wibird, *Parson*, sermon, 247.
Wichita, Kans., cattle drives to, 311.
Wielopolski, 201.
Willard, Samuel, *Compleat Body of Divinity*, 230.
Wilson, George G., requests com. to cooperate with hist. sec. of Navy Dept., 106.
Winston, James E., of membership com. (1921), 21. 104.
Winthrop, John, *Modell of Christian Charity*, 232.
Wisconsin, war records collection, 136.
Wisconsin Domesday Book, 38, 150.
Wisconsin State Historical Society, calendaring French archives, 133; Wisconsin Domesday Book, 38, 150.
Witos, Polish premier, 207.
Women's City Club, vote of thanks to, 107.
Woodburn, James A., of membership com. (1921), 21, 108.
Woodward, Robert S., pres. Carnegie Institution, 40.
World History in the High School, Johnson, 39.
World War, check list, 69.
Wrench, Jesse E., of membership com. (1921), 108.
Writing of history, A. H. A. spec. com. (1921), 23, 51, 105.
Writings on American History, policy com. recommendation, 68, 70, 103; account of, 77, 83.
Wyatt's Insurrection, 191.
Wynne, John P., of membership com. (1921), 21, 108.
Young, Arthur, agricultural instruction, 299.
Young, Levi E., pres. P. C. B. (1920), 121; delegate to A. H. A. council meeting, 122; *Religious Influences in the History of the West*, 123-124.
Y. M. C. A., war publications, 142; war records, 143.
Zamojski, of Polish Natl. Com., 201.
Zook, George F., of membership com. (1921), 21, 104, (1920), 84; sec. local arrangements com. (1920), 35.